

may well determine whether democracy will survive or perish.

We must provide for the growth and well-being of an expanding economy, secure and train the necessary manpower for a world of advancing technology. We must insure new avenues of communication and understanding. Much of this responsibility rests to a large degree on our colleges and universities. They will not be found wanting. But make no mistake, meeting freedom's challenge is not just a task for educators. It is a job for every man and woman in this country. You, me, the fellow next door.

It is the challenge to freemen to maintain, protect and enhance the dignity and worth of the individual to increase the concept, the meaning, the understanding and the application of freedom to guard and protect the American way of life and to insure the growth of the spirit of man as he reaches for the stars.

In a material, down-to-earth sense the protection of our freedom is a manpower problem. In a word, we are outnumbered. We simply do not have the manpower that the totalitarian nations have. We cannot compete in numerical strength with the hordes that temporarily swept back the forces of freedom in Korea or overpowered our allies in Indochina, nor can we build our fortifications on the backs of coolie labor, nor would we even wish to do so.

We hear much these days about the increase in population. But the growth of population does not mean that we will automatically have a labor force that is adequate to all the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In 1940 we were a nation of 132 million. Today we have reached 170 million. By 1980, it is expected that our population will have grown to 250 million. But these figures bear a little study.

The fact is, the population explosion is largely centered in the groups at either end of the age scale—among the young and old. The number of people in the prime working years has remained relatively constant and will for the next 20 years.

Thus, by 1980, when our total population will have risen to the tremendous total of 250 million, we will have fewer people in the most productive bracket (40-50) than we have today.

Not only that, but our younger workers will be living and working in an increasingly complex and technical world. They will be responsible for the future productive balance, for progressively high standards of performance, and much of the leadership that this Nation and the entire free world will so greatly need.

This lack of raw manpower can only be counterbalanced by a determination to train and make available the skilled manpower which is the basic fruit of freedom. The needs of the future demand that every facet of our educational system must provide more rigorous training and demand higher levels of achievement and excellence. Unless we have the fullest possible development of the Nation's fundamental resources in the years ahead, we will indeed be in desperate danger.

Probably an even more important part of the challenge to freemen, is the necessity for rededication to that faith and to those ideals which brought freedom and democracy into existence—those essential character qualities that make a nation strong. Paradoxically the very qualities which have made us great have brought us a living that has weakened those qualities. We are called the affluent nation. We have more money, more prosperity, and more of the good things of life than any nation on earth. In possession of these material things, have we, perhaps, lost some of our respect for hard work, thrift, sacrifice, devotion to duty, and loyalty to common good? These are strengths which we must recapture in order to hold fast our freedom.

Recently I read from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt a statement that ought to be imprinted in the mind of every American today.

He said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

The challenge of freedom has another front—a world front. We seek freedom not only for ourselves but for all men everywhere. But despite all we have attempted to do we have, somehow failed to communicate with them.

The true image of America is being grossly distorted in critical areas around the world. This is more than unfortunate in these crucial times; it is a serious threat. We have seen the resulting damage in the neutral countries, even in friendly nations, and certainly among the undeclared peoples. Our motives are twisted by vicious propaganda and we are made to appear as a rich and grasping nation, concerned only with our own selfish advantage. We see the evil effects of lack of understanding even in the shadow of our own coastline. It would indeed be a cruel turn of events if a generous people should lose because of their failure to adequately communicate the meaning of freedom. It would be a dangerous turn if we should fail to interpret the blessings of democracy and thus lose potential friends to a contrary way of life and find ourselves exposed and alone.

Our failure to enunciate clearly the meaning of democracy is not only a failure in communication but in understanding. Loyalty and love can't be bought. We have learned that lesson the hard way.

New technology has made it possible for us to communicate in many new ways, to inform, unify or divide our world as never before, but wonderful as the new technology tools may be, they are still only tools of transmittal. We must remember that the most marvelous media can communicate no more and no less than a man can feel and express and impart from the mind and the heart and the soul.

Though the transmittal be orbited through space to impinge upon this and other worlds for the rest of time, what still really counts is the substance of the message

and its applicability and meaning to those for whom it is intended. And the substance depends upon the real meaning of freedom.

It is the substance that we must communicate to all the world. It is this substance which must be the warp and woof of all our education.

This is freedom's challenge to all of us. How shall we meet it?

1. We can meet it by increasing our education for democratic citizenship and in saying this I give much credit to Fairleigh Dickinson for the programs already in operation on every one of your campuses. The extension work you are carrying on, the evening school programs, the off-campus activities, the reexamination and reorientation of your entrance requirements, the sharpening of your curricula, the adult education programs, and your ability to fit into the communities you serve—all of these heart-warming activities bespeak your interest and understanding.

2. It is important that all our citizens gain new understanding of the meaning of democracy and liberty and freedom. Active participation in public affairs can no longer be left to the few. The right to vote is not only a privilege; it is an obligation. The duty of keeping informed is no longer a duty but a necessity. The study of government can no longer be confined to the pages of a textbook—it is a way of life.

3. We can meet the challenge of freedom with an old-fashioned rededication to the virtues which inspired that freedom.

4. We must educate for more efficient and effective manpower. Our present waste of human resources must be stopped. We must educate for the pursuit of excellence by building an educational program that will discover and encourage the abilities and potentialities of every single individual.

We must educate for greater understanding among all peoples. Education must challenge our own young people with an idealism, a feeling of mission, a better understanding of themselves and the world in which they live, and appreciation of the brotherhood of man and a realization of the power and the glory of a working democracy.

But we must export this education (and import a bit of it, as well) by the exchange of teachers and students with foreign countries, by the establishment of branch universities in other lands, by informational centers, by all the ingenuity at our command.

Such an educational program is now in operation and a number of governmental agencies have the responsibility to speed its progress. But the program cannot be entirely a governmental responsibility. Its success will depend in great measure upon the initiative, the resourcefulness, the ability, and the understanding of the individuals of our great foundations, of religious and social organizations, of educational institutions, of schools and colleges, and faculties and individual teachers. Only thus can success be assured. Only thus can we fully meet the challenge, the obligation, and the responsibility that freemen must meet, if freedom is to prevail.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph Vaskas, Marian Hills Seminary, Clarendon Hills, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and merciful God, we adore Thee and we thank Thee for Thy loving providence, which from all eternity hath

predestined this continent to be discovered by Western man only as recently as 1492 in order that it become a haven and a home for the oppressed and persecuted peoples of the world. We thank Thee for having enriched it so prodigally with the goods of this earth, that, according to Thine own example and precept, we are now able to help and succor the needy of the world from our own superabundant stores. We thank Thee for having given our forefathers a living faith, so deeprooted, vigorous, and unequivocal, they caused to have engraved

on the metal of our coins the inscription: "In God We Trust." We thank Thee for the farsighted wisdom and prudence of the Founding Fathers of our Republic, who gave us a Constitution, the principles of which are but the eternal law as applied to the organization and administration of a free and ordered society of men. In Thy provident wisdom, Thou hast permitted the people of this Republic, strong in their faith in Thee and in the spiritual, cultural, and material wealth with which Thou hast deigned to bless them, to emerge today as the most powerful

and benevolent Nation on earth. Grant us to understand, O Lord, that this prerogative of eminence is weighted with a corresponding responsibility before Thy judgment seat and that of the world in which Thou hast allotted us to play such an important and decisive part. Faithful to its historic and noble national traditions of justice and charity in both its domestic and international relations, may our Nation and its Government persevere and triumph in the good fight it leads in waging for that peace, based on justice and charity, which is the tranquillity of order. It is for this tranquillity of order that captive, exiled, and free Lithuanians throughout the world are praying today, O just and merciful God, on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, that in this peaceful order of justice and charity, enslaved Lithuania, together with her sister Baltic Republics Latvia and Estonia, and all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and wherever in the world, would again and soon enjoy all the rights and blessings of a free, independent, and sovereign people.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1962, was read and approved.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the acting majority leader if he will kindly inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, to be followed by H.R. 10050, temporary debt ceiling increase for fiscal 1962, if a rule is reported.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week we will have H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

On Thursday, even though we may have not finished the Manpower Development and Training Act, we will have read the Farewell Address of President Washington.

Of course, conference reports will be in order at any time during the week, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 21, 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### POWERS IS NOT A SPY—ABEL IS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is real gain for the United States in the Soviet Union's release of Francis Gary Powers and Frederic L. Pryor in return for Colonel Abel's being permitted to go back to the Soviet Union.

From the time of Abel's arrest until the present the Soviet Union has refused to admit that this master spy was one of its agents. Now, Moscow itself has, in effect, confirmed the trial exposure of the espionage activities of Colonel Abel and the others who were members of his apparatus in the United States.

At the same time, I deplore the fact that a significant segment of the U.S. press is giving great aid to the Soviet Union by repeatedly describing Powers as a spy and his release in return for that of Colonel Abel as a spy swap.

A press dispatch of February 12, which was a featured page 1 story in newspapers across the country, opened with the following words:

#### AMERICAN U-2 SPY PILOT FRANCIS GARY POWERS

On February 11 and 12, articles written by two different New York Times reporters and published in that newspaper referred to Powers and Abel as two celebrated spies of the cold war.

On February 11, the New York Times went so far as to report falsely that Powers had earned the unusual distinction of having been acknowledged as a spy by the U.S. Government.

Numerous headlines and articles published in newspapers in this country during the past few days have referred to Powers as a spy pilot and to the exchange as a spy trade.

Thus, with the help of the U.S. press, Khrushchev has been able to get across to the American people and to the people of many other nations the one big propaganda point that he wants to sell them on—his phony claim of U.S. guilt in a flagrant case of espionage on the eve of the May 1960 summit conference which justified his torpedoing the conference and then reneging on his agreement to have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union.

Most competent newspaper editors, with the best interests of this country at heart, would flatly reject such Communist-serving statements if they were released by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Too many of these same editors, however, have accepted statements of this type put out by wire services and their own reporters.

From the very beginning the U.S. Government has correctly refused to admit Moscow's false claim that Powers was guilty of espionage. It has defended the U-2 flights as legitimate aerial surveillance and intelligence gathering that was essential and of vital necessity to protect this country from surprise attack.

Espionage, by its very definition, is secret and covert. Open intelligence gathering, which includes reconnaissance of various types, including plane flights, is not espionage. For about 4 years before Powers' crash in the Soviet Union, Powers, and possibly other U.S. pilots, had been flying U-2's in reconnaissance flights over Soviet territory. With modern methods of detection, these marked planes with their 90-foot wingspreads—even when flying at 80,000 feet—were about as secret or covert as a tank rumbling down a street. Whether Powers' plane was taking photographs or gathering some other type of intelligence data is beside the point. The important fact is that the Soviet Union, for a period of several years, had been able to detect these planes flying openly over its territory, obviously on reconnaissance missions.

It knew that they were there, but rather than admit to the world that it did not have any weapon capable of bringing them down, it made no public protest.

It is most unfortunate that some newspapers and a major wire service in this country are now undermining the correct U.S. position in the Powers case, giving credence to Khrushchev's false contentions and seemingly justifying his outrageous conduct.

The Soviet Union undoubtedly wanted Abel returned because although his value as an espionage agent is now destroyed, his experience in this country could be put to good use in training other Soviet agents for assignment here. Despite this, the United States gained by obtaining the release from Communist prisons of two American citizens who were innocent of the charges made against them. Although these men are not spies and have not been trained in espionage, we should get from Powers the answers to some important questions, including that of just what caused the crash of his U-2 reconnaissance plane on May 1, 1960.

#### THE LITTLE-PEOPLE-TO-LITTLE- PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our citizens have been inspired and are responding to the President's already historic words delivered in his inaugural address:

Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

Among those thousands is my 10-year-old son, Peter.

Like most American children today, Peter is vitally aware of the problems our Nation faces. He realizes the solution of those problems is the job and the duty of you and me, and all other Government officials, aided by all of our citizens. But he does not allow his youth and inexperience to curb his thinking of the problems and their solution.

Overriding all other problems is the threat to the very existence of our own and yet unborn generations of people everywhere that hangs over the world in the form of the Russian bombs' fallout cloud.

Peter knows that many fine men from our own and other governments have been trying through conferences to persuade the Communist leaders to stop atmospheric testing.

But—

He told us one night at dinner—

maybe Mr. Khrushchev does not believe the ordinary people in America and other countries really want him to stop the bombing. Maybe if a lot of children wrote him, he would believe it. If he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs.

So Peter wrote to Mr. Khrushchev. He talked about it with his chums. They wrote, too. And, as the idea spread, other children from beyond our neighborhood heard about, and now many of them are writing. Parent Teacher Associations, Boy Scout groups and veterans' organizations are encouraging still more children to write. It is beginning to take shape as a real children's crusade.

When the President appointed General Eisenhower head of the people-to-people program, it seemed that Peter's activity was a natural corollary—a little-people-to-little-people program. The general and Mr. Nutter, the executive director of the program, agree and I am working with them to develop the little-people program.

After some discussion, we have decided to broaden the scope of this modern-day children's crusade. We agree that a fallout of letters to the Soviet Premier would have a stimulating psychological effect on people throughout the non-Communist world; but we wonder if it will have much effect on Khrushchev or the Comintern. We are apprehensive, moreover, that a fallout of letters about the bomb alone would intensify the Comintern delusions of grandeur that they are the masters of world events.

The project that we feel will be most effective is a massive worldwide effort, started here in the United States, to discredit and destroy the myth of communism in the minds of men throughout the world.

We believe that an important task in this project is to enlist the youngsters of our Nation into this political warfare

which we didn't start, but which we do have to fight.

To be sure, this is taking a page from their own book. The Communists start the political training of their citizens at an early age, enlisting their youth in the young pioneer movement, preparing them for more sophisticated political training. I think we must conclude that this has been an effective system for the Communists. It can be even more effective for freemen. For we shall write on the white pages of freedom, not on the red pages of tyranny.

Let us use their example to initiate a movement that will give the children of the free world some facts about today's world. We know from various polls that at the moment our own youth, and many among our adult population, believe that communism is bad, but they do not know for sure because they do not know what communism really stands for, and does and is. We know, also, from the experience of our men captured during the Korean episode, that there is a concomitant ignorance about America, what our country and way of life stand for, do and are.

My colleagues, I believe we have a unique opportunity and a special responsibility to organize that movement here. We in the two bodies of Congress come from every corner of our great Nation. Some bring our families here, but, as we hope will be shown next November, our roots are in the districts we represent. We have available to us the scholarly and timely publications of our distinguished congressional committees, of the executive departments and agencies and all other appropriate material as soon as it is published. What better than we can give this movement an auspicious start and insure its orderly, successful momentum? Who better than we who meet in the Chambers of this building understands the utter need of our Nation to lead the fight of freemen everywhere against the Red menace. Let us answer the Communist crusade for world domination with our children's crusade for world education. Let us give meaning to the battle cry of freedom—"better brave than slave."

I solicit your comments. I ask your help. I shall welcome both.

#### THE KREMLIN'S CRIME

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the session of Congress now before us promises to be one of the most crucial in our national history. Under your wise and dedicated leadership, it promises to be also one of the most fruitful.

Two among the many vital and urgent issues that will come before us stand apart in their importance. For while most issues are concerned directly only with our own domestic welfare today, these two transcend all boundaries, spatial and temporal. Their significance reaches across the seven seas, and

touches everywhere all nations, their institutions, their people—even those nations not yet named, those institutions not yet founded, those generations as yet unborn.

The two issues of such heroic, historical importance are: first, resumption of nuclear testing; and, second, America's trade policy.

It is to the first that I address myself today.

My feelings about the bomb, about the entire armaments race, you know well. You will remember that I and others among you introduced bills in 1960 and 1961 that ultimately led to the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Through the leadership of our Agency, I hoped, I still hope, that the road to peace may be found for all the world.

But in November at Geneva I attended some of the meetings of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests. My colleagues, it was a most distressing affair. For while the distinguished British Minister of State, Joseph Godber, and our own equally distinguished delegate, Arthur H. Dean, came and spoke with earnest dedication to the task at hand, the Russians prevented the attainment of any progress.

Having contemptuously disregarded the entire world and poured more poison into the atmosphere in their 1961 tests than the total of all previous tests, the Russians dared to take the pose of being opposed to nuclear weapons. With their 1961 series concluded, they ignored the carefully prepared test-ban treaty draft which had been submitted to them last April by Mr. Dean, and substituted for it a meaningless four-paragraph agreement on banning the tests—with no attempt at monitoring controls.

Mr. Dean has my complete admiration for the courageous way he maintained his composure, and for continuing with his sincere and determined efforts to achieve progress toward a test ban.

Shortly after my return from Geneva, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, speaking for the President, announced that the United States and Russia had agreed to the formation of an 18 nation committee to begin negotiations toward general and complete disarmament.

When I heard this, I thought back to Geneva. And when I thought back to Geneva, I thought of the utter hypocrisy of daring to speak about banning almost at the very time they were bombing.

Two weeks ago, the Russians delivered another blow against disarmament when they broke up the 3-year-old negotiations for nuclear test-ban agreements. This week their leaders are nonresponsive to the efforts of our President and Prime Minister Macmillan for a Foreign Ministers' Disarmament Conference.

We do not want to resume atmospheric nuclear testing, for our own sake, but, more importantly, for the sake of our children and of those not yet born all over the world. By the words of her President and Congress, America has proclaimed this again and again for all the world to hear.

As Americans we can all be proud of our Presidents, and their representatives, in their sustained and dedicated

attempts in the past 3 years to remove the threat of the poison of nuclear tests.

If further negotiations are not at the moment possible, if the atmosphere is again contaminated, it will not be because of America. For these crimes against humanity itself, the leaders in the Kremlin, and they alone, will be guilty.

#### LIMITATION ON PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill today to provide that the President be authorized to purchase up to \$100 million in United Nations bonds in an amount equal to that which is subscribed by other nations or individuals.

The United Nations has been a valuable asset to the world over the 17 years of its existence. It has proven to be a valuable instrument of the U.S. foreign policy over these years. Basic to its past value and its future success in our own conduct of foreign affairs and in that of other member nations is the universality of its support.

As a financial transaction, the United Nations bond issue is rather noncontroversial. The bonds will pay interest and will be repaid over a period not to exceed 25 years. The U.S. Government has loaned the United Nations money before. The Republican-controlled 80th Congress authorized the lending of \$65 million to the U.N. for construction of its present headquarters facilities. Repayment of that obligation has been in strict accordance with the lending agreement. As a debtor, the United Nations has established a perfect credit record with its creditor, the United States.

From the standpoint of fiscal operations of the United Nations, the bond issue is vital. United Nations obligations have exceeded income on its special project missions. This has been caused by reluctance of member nations to pay special assessments authorized by the General Assembly to carry on the police activities of the organization.

It is obvious, then, that the bond issue is sound financing by the United Nations and sound lending by the United States. The critical problem at issue in the current debate is whether or not the United Nations serves a useful purpose to the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs and whether or not it merits further support as an instrument of our foreign policy. To analyze the issue, it is necessary, therefore, to make a general review of the activities of the United Nations, and how they have affected our Nation and its goals in the world.

The United Nations was created in 1945 prior to the end of World War II at a conference in San Francisco. It was organized with the support and with the insistence of the leaders of the Allied Powers who were fighting and winning

the war against tyranny. The purposes set forth in the preamble of the U.N. Charter are basically the preservation of peace with the corresponding prevention of future wars, and the promotion of the basic concept of human dignity with a corresponding recognition of human rights.

When the charter was drawn, the atomic age had not yet dawned. The exploration of space was still a science fiction subject. America and Russia were allies and China was ruled by Chiang Kai-shek. The Security Council was formed with practical recognition of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China as the political and economic leaders of the world. In the Security Council they were given broad powers to keep the peace and each given a veto power over proceedings in that Council. In practice, the General Assembly has grown more powerful and more dynamic in carrying out the objectives of the charter in recent years.

Since that San Francisco Conference just 17 years ago, the world has undergone the most rapid and most effective social, political, and technological revolution in history. More than one-fourth of all the world's people—700 million—have thrown off the yoke of colonialism since 1945. The progress of human rights and human dignity has been at its most rapid pace in man's history. Technology has opened new worlds and created vast new fields of opportunity for human endeavor.

In this complex and changing environment, the United Nations has stood as the central clearinghouse for disputes, the champion of civil rights and liberties, and the source of political guidance for all of the nations in the world. It has not always been as effective as it could or should have been. There are instances which anyone might cite as the failures of the U.N. to live up to its ideals and goals.

In the 17 years of the United Nations, the United States has relied heavily on it as its basic instrument of foreign policy. When the Korean peace was broken, President Truman turned to the U.N. to provide the solution. When President Eisenhower sought to promote peaceful use of the atom and to provide for disarmament through aerial inspection, he turned to the U.N. to present his "atoms for peace" and "open skies" proposals. When chaos developed in the newly independent nation of the Congo, Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy relied on the U.N. to establish the rule of law.

Certainly the United States has relied heavily on the United Nations and not always with complete success. The Soviet Union has been forced to use her veto power in the Security Council more than 100 times to thwart implementation of free world policies. With the increased membership due to the newly emerging independent nations, control of the actual voting assembly has passed informally from the Western democracies to the new nations of Asia and Africa. American dominance of the assembly has, therefore, waned, but there has not been an increase in Soviet-bloc control.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy this year asked for a vote of confidence in the United Nations. He said:

Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority, but as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America.

A critical analysis of the United Nations and its role in U.S. foreign policy will show that the world organization has consistently been a force for peace and instrument for good which we have been able to use to good advantage. It needs our continued support and the support of all member nations to continue to be successful. I believe that this universality of support is a critical point in the prospects for the United Nations. The United Nations needs the moral, political, and financial support of all its members. It must have a universal foundation on which to build for progress. U.S. leadership in this support is good and worth while, but it cannot be a substitute for the participation of the entire membership.

The United Nations is a world organization with 105 sovereign member nations. Its value and its successes to a large degree are dependent on the scope of moral, political, and financial support that it receives from its members.

This is not a phenomenon unique to the world organization. It is a simple and basic fact of political life whether it be on the local scale of a village, on the metropolitan level, or the State level; it is also true in the international organization that the effectiveness of a governmental organization is largely dependent on the base of active support for that governmental organization.

I believe that a basic premise on which our support of the United Nations rests is that the organization has the support of its member nations and the respect of the world. Without this, it is bound to be ineffective and doomed to crippling inactivity.

I believe that this position should be made clear to the world. By limiting our own participation in the U.N. bond issue to an amount equal to that which has been subscribed by other nations, this basic promise of our support is emphasized.

The State Department has indicated that they have received favorable reaction to the issue from 25 other nations and that 6 nations already making commitments have agreed to buy nearly \$30 million in bonds. This gives me great confidence that the other nations will bear their full share of the financial burden and that our share will eventually amount to \$100 million. Other nations must recognize the need for strong universal support of the United Nations; and with our lead, I am con-

fidant this method of authorization will not in any way imperil the total success of the bond sale but will, in fact, be beneficial to it.

The United States has long borne the major burden of financial support for the United Nations. I do not address myself to this fact or to its desirability or undesirability. There are certainly logical reasons for our large share of the financial support of the organization. But along with our support, there must be the support of other member nations. By charter, the United Nations demands universal support of its members through annual assessments. The reluctance to pay special assessments for specific activities is damaging to the moral strength of the U.N. as well as to its financial position.

Let us stand now and tell our fellow members that our support hinges on yours. What the United Nations needs is not more and more of our support, but more participation by the entire membership. Let us make our position on this vital point clear by authorizing the purchase of the bond issue only in such amount as that which is subscribed by other nations.

And let this not be construed as a lack of support on the part of our Nation of the United Nations. Let it be taken as intended as a declaration of support and a position favoring multilateral support of the organization. It is in the own best interests of the United Nations to have broad support. My proposal is directed toward the best interests of the organization and is aimed at strengthening its position in the world.

I ask the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider this proposal along with the request of the President. I believe it provides the substance for which he has asked and adds strengthening influence in recording the U.S. sentiment for broad and universal support of United Nations operations.

#### DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from some of the comments made by those attacking the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, one would believe that this new Department would be concerned solely with big cities. If this is a big city proposal, who would be concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns? After all, nearly 50 percent of the urban population of the United States live in cities and towns of under 50,000 population.

Part of the answer to this charge is in the President's message transmitting the reorganization plan. In that message he said:

It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities.

Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated in a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities.

The evident concern of the President is certainly to the point, and one that should be considered by all of the Members of the House whose constituencies include small cities and towns. But also to the point is the extent to which the programs of the Housing Agency have been tailored to the needs of smaller cities and the extent of small city participation in these programs.

An outstanding example of this is the public facility loan program which assists small cities in obtaining financing for their public works at reasonable interest rates. With the exception of some communities in redevelopment areas, this entire program is concerned with the needs of cities with populations of under 50,000.

The program of Federal advances for planning specific public works is another Housing Agency activity which has been predominantly concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns. Eighty percent of the applications for these planning advances have come from cities with a population of less than 50,000. Of this 80 percent, approximately half have come from communities with populations of under 5,000.

The program of Federal grants for overall urban planning is still another outstanding example of the way in which the programs of the Housing Agency serve the needs of smaller communities, and of the way in which these smaller communities are voluntarily participating in the programs. Over 2,000 localities with populations of less than 50,000 have received, or are receiving assistance to help them to the kind of planning which is so necessary for sound local decisionmaking. This represents 85 percent of the total number of communities receiving assistance under this program.

The urban renewal program is frequently talked about as being a big-city program, but what is little recognized is that it is also a small-city program. Over 63 percent of the localities participating in the urban renewal program have populations of less than 50,000 and have undertaken 43 percent of the total number of projects. This Congress has recognized the special importance of urban renewal to small cities and the special problems involved. In the recently enacted Housing Act of 1961, cities with populations under 50,000 were accorded 75-percent grants as compared with the two-thirds grants available to larger cities.

Public housing is also a concern of smaller localities. Eighty-six percent of the more than 1,500 communities participating in the public housing program had populations of less than 50,000. More than half of the participating com-

munities had populations of less than 10,000.

With this record before us, I think the conclusion is clear—the programs of the Housing Agency are meant for communities of all sizes and communities of all sizes have been participating in these programs. It is clear from the President's message that he intends this new Department to serve all of the cities in America.

#### MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in my view, the single most important domestic issue before the Congress this year is that of providing adequate medical and hospital care for the elderly. This is a "gut" issue that involves the health and welfare of millions of older persons who cannot absorb the costs of a lengthy illness. It is an issue that other major industrial nations in the West have resolved by adopting, as did Great Britain, a national health plan. As a larger proportion of our population is concentrated in the older age category, provision for adequate medical care will remain a major problem that can neither be avoided nor interred.

I think it instructive, Mr. Speaker, to look at the position of that great closed-shop trade union of the medical profession, the American Medical Association. And in recent months we have had an opportunity to peek behind the gauze curtain, so to speak, and see what is inside.

The Journal of the American Medical Association, an official publication, in September 1961, carried an article bearing on the remarks of a William DeMougeot, professor of speech at North Texas State University, to an AMA institute. He analyzed the arguments put forth by the AMA against any form of Government interest in medical care and what did he find? Well the speech professor is quoted to this effect:

Remember that most of the arguments we've examined work quite well on most people . . . it's only when facing more informed audiences or arguing with an intelligent opponent who possesses some of the facts I've cited that the vulnerabilities I've mentioned become a problem.

So what are these arguments that the AMA seemingly with success palmed off on the uninformed?

The speech professor listed five that he labeled as scare arguments.

National health insurance will be a step toward socialism—well now, countered the professor, for those attracted by slogans this may prove an effective argument. But, said the professor:

For more sophisticated people, it is the most flagrant sort of propaganda—name calling—and it has long since lost its respectability because conservatives have applied it to almost all social legislation.

Scare argument No. 2 is that the Federal Government will control medical care and both patient and doctor will lose freedom.

This—

Said our professor—

is simply not true—of course, not everyone could have the best doctor, to prevent overloading; but does the average person have that privilege now? \* \* \* This is a good argument with which to scare people, but you'd better not use it if you have an audience or an opponent who knows how foreign systems are run.

Scare argument No. 3: The quality of medical care will deteriorate. Mr. DeMougeot said:

There have been unnecessary calls and arbitrary demands but the person who has put off needed medical care because of costs will prefer second-rate care to no care. And, besides, he said 71 percent of physicians in Britain felt the system helped them to fend off serious illnesses.

Bogey-man argument No. 4 is that the system will be expensive. The reply given the AMA Institute audience here is that Britain spends only 4 to 4½ percent of its national income on the health service to give complete care to all, while we in the United States spend even more for much less care quantitatively and their percentage is going down while ours is rising.

He estimated that in Britain about \$50 is spent per person for a rather complete system, while in the United States about \$114 is spent for partial care. And he added:

Do not treat the taxes which support such a system as if they would be an additional burden on each American; most such taxes would merely replace what is now spent on medical care.

A national health plan has failed in foreign nations and therefore we should avoid it here. This final scare argument simply has no basis in fact, according to Mr. DeMougeot, since 59 nations have adopted a national compulsory system of State payment for medical care and none has abandoned it, this argument hardly holds. And he points out the United States is the only major nation in the world without such a national plan.

So now the arguments most frequently used by the AMA lobby have been shown to be both specious and demagogic.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the AMA News of September 4, 1961, under the business and finance section where physicians are shown how to get a tax break. There are Federal income tax advantages to the physician and his family which he should consider in deciding whether to have a member of his immediate family work for him in his business, the article points out.

Parenthetically I point out that the AMA's opposition to having physicians covered by social security is well known. But this article in the AMA News, also an official publication, boldly suggests that a doctor pay \$10 a week to his mother for straightening up his office. He could then deduct 3 percent from her

wages and send it along with a matching 3 percent as employer to the Social Security Administration. This would be employment creditable toward social security benefits for the mother and, happily, the article goes on, the physician would have a business deduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I really despair for the health of the medical profession when I encounter such items as I have been reading.

When the AMA is driven, as it is being driven, from trench to trench and finally takes up a stand in its final redoubt I have a feeling its final proposal to offset a needed comprehensive medical insurance plan will be on the order of providing medical and hospitalization care for Americans on condition they work off the bill by doing weekend ward duty in hospitals—carry trays, handle bedpans, work in the kitchen and the laundry. On past performances, I think the AMA is capable of making such a proposal. There are thousands of devoted and able physicians in the United States, among them my personal physician. But I suggest that the AMA is unrepresentative of their thinking.

#### JAY N. "DING" DARLING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the curtain has been drawn on the life of Jay N. "Ding" Darling, one of Iowa's most distinguished citizens and long one of the Nation's favorite cartoonists as well as a powerful leader in the battle for conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Darling died of a heart ailment in Des Moines last Monday at the age of 85.

Twice, in 1924 and again in 1943, Mr. Darling won the Pulitzer Prize. In 1934, in a poll conducted by Editor and Publisher, the Nation's leading editors named him the best newspaper cartoonist.

Alarmed by the critical drop in the population of migratory waterfowl as a result of the drought years, Mr. Darling left his drawing board in 1935 to take an \$8,000 job as Chief of the Biological Survey in Washington and launched the successful campaign that stands today as a monument to his efforts. For this and his other great contributions to the conservation of natural resources he was made honorary life president of the National Wildlife Federation.

In 1949, after a 48-year career, "Ding" Darling laid aside his eloquent pen. He used it once again in 1958 when, seriously ill, he drew a last cartoon and instructed his secretary to keep it hidden until after his death. It was a farewell to his legion of friends and admirers. It was published in the Des Moines Register last Tuesday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I join today in mourning the death of this distinguished American, and personal friend.

#### "PHANTOM ACRES" PAYMENTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman's flimsy explanation of phantom acres payments in the 1961 feed grains program makes it apparent he will try to perpetuate this \$150 million annual waste in the 1962 and future programs.

In a speech to a regional meeting of the USDA Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service February 8, 1962, in Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Freeman said:

The facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Actually, Mr. Freeman's facts bring the phantom acres down to earth with a \$150 million thud that is loud enough for all taxpayers to hear. The responsibility and the blame rests with Mr. Freeman, not with the farmers. It is obvious he will do nothing to stop this waste. The 1962 feed grains sign-up has already started. Congress itself must take the initiative.

Under the 1961 program, Mr. Freeman was supposed to base payments on average 1959-60 plantings. In corn, for example, the average was 82.2 million acres, according to official USDA reports. Instead he based payments on 87 million acres—up 5 million acres.

At an average of \$30 an acre these cost \$150 million.

Why the difference? Why does the USDA use two different figures to represent 1959-60 average planting? Here is Mr. Freeman's explanation, a full transcript from the test prepared for his February 8 speech in Atlanta:

Another catchy phrase used to deride the efforts of more than a million farmers taking part in the program has been phantom acres.

At the risk of using too many figures, I want to be very specific—this is a charge that needs to be nailed.

A check of feed grain acreage on participating and nonparticipating farms reveals the true facts.

While participants were reducing their acreage even more than diversions under the program, acreage of feed grains on nonparticipating farms was increasing. The check shows that participants underplanted their permitted acreage by 6.2 million. Nonparticipants increased their acreages by 6.7 million.

Let's take this further. While the law based acreages to be used in the program on average 1959-60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms. As a result, base acreages used under the program were higher than the simple 1959-60 planted-acre averages. But participants underplanted their actual 1959-60 acreage by 2 million acres more than the 25.2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.

A part of the effort of participating farmers to stop unneeded production was nullified by acreage increases on other farms. The increases by noncooperators could not be

known at the time the critics were trying to show discrepancies in program figures and to create their phantom acres. Now, however, the facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Mr. Freeman was on target when he alluded to the risk of using too many figures. He used too many which were meaningless. As a matter of fact, none of the figures he used has anything to do with phantom acres.

His figures relate to planting in 1961. Phantom acres relate solely to the 1959-60 average plantings.

What farmers did, or did not do, in 1961 cannot change the record for 1959-60.

Mr. Freeman takes note of the fact that participants underplanted their permitted acreages by 6.2 million. This is misleading.

It fails to mention that farmers were free to use these acres for other crops, that such underplanting is normal in all similar programs, and that the figure relates to 1961, not the period in question.

He mentions nonparticipants. Are farmers who did not sign up but increased their plantings by 6.7 million acres to blame for phantom acres? Of course not. Here again, the figure relates to 1961, not 1959-60.

Mr. Freeman states that participants underplanted their actual 1959-60 acres by 2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.

This is a back handed way of saying that farmers claimed underplanting 27.2 million acres but were paid for only 25.2 million acres.

One can reasonably conclude that Mr. Freeman thus eliminated 2 million phantom acres. Why? What's the difference between one phantom acre and another? Why pay for 5 million of them but deny payment for 2 million others?

If all phantom acres consist of nothing but thin, hot air, as Mr. Freeman says, why play favorites?

In the final paragraph of Mr. Freeman's defense, he blames phantom acres on increased planting by noncooperators. Once again, this is irrelevant, having no bearing on 1959-60.

Mr. Freeman's one and only statement which relates directly to phantom acres is this:

While the law based acres to be used in the program on average 1959-60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms.

In other words, in any program of this type, room is needed for corrections and appeals. Otherwise, inequities will occur. This is certainly fair and reasonable, but in all previous programs—to-bacco, rice, cotton, wheat—this room for correction and appeals has been provided within the total acreage base.

In cotton, for example, USDA administrators reserve about 5 percent of the total acreage base to provide room to adjust for inequities among farms.

In drafting and voting for the 1961 feed grains bill, Congress confidently

expected that the same administrative standard would apply here.

Nothing in the bill's legislative history gave a hint of what was to follow.

After enactment of the bill, the Department of Agriculture announced—Federal Register, June 15, 1961, page 5358:

In those counties where the Department of Agriculture has established the average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage produced in the county in 1959 and 1960 for use as a guide in determining the feed grain base for farms in the county, the total feed grain bases for all farms in the county, excluding any increase in farm feed grain base resulting from corrections, requests for reconsideration or appeals, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 495.13 to the extent practicable, shall not exceed 105 percent of such average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage.

This was a clear invitation to 5 percent exaggeration in the 1959-60 planted-acre average, and it also opened the door so the acreage needed for corrections and appeals could be added to the 5-percent boost.

In corn alone, the 5-percent leeway produced 4,100,000 of the phantom acres. Allowances for corrections and appeals accounts for the rest.

The mystery of the phantom acres is solved. They are the result of an unprecedented regulatory interpretation.

This interpretation wasted \$150 million last year and will do the same needlessly this year unless my bill, H.R. 9329—to prohibit payment for phantom acres—is passed.

For an account of previous efforts to stop payments for phantom acres, refer to page 563, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 18, 1962.

#### A PLEDGE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend by remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to describe a most unusual ceremony, possibly the only time it has ever occurred in the United States, which took place at Brant Beach, Ocean County, N.J., on January 25, 1962, when a French flag which was found washed up on the ocean shore was identified and delivered to the French Consul for return to its owners.

This flag which belonged to a group of French Army recruits drafted in 1922 was found by two boys, Vincent Scali and James Walzak, both 11 years old and members of the fifth grade in the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, washed up on the beach and they took it home with them. Later they brought it to school and showed it to their French teacher, Miss Joan Singley. Inscribed on the flag were the words "Honneur Aux Conscrits—RF—Classe 1922—Blainville-Sur l'Eau," and Miss Singley

promptly wrote to the mayor of Blainville-Sur l'Eau asking for any information he could give concerning it. Under date of October 27, 1961, she received a reply, as follows:

BLAINVILLE-SUR-L'EAU,  
MEURTHE AND MOSELLE,  
October 27, 1961.

Miss JOAN M. SINGLEY,  
French teacher, Long Beach Island grade school, Ship Bottom, N.J.

DEAR MISS: I have the honor to inform you of the receipt of your letter of October 20, 1961, which didn't fail to surprise me. Here are the answers to your questions.

In France the custom is that young men having reached their 20th birthday, undergo a collective medical examination called the council of review which declares them fit or unfit for military service. These young men join together and make up a group called the class (nothing in common with school).

They all contribute and buy a flag with the lettering which you have seen. The care of the flag is confided, by drawing lots, to one of the draftees.

For the class of 1922, the young man chosen was killed in 1944 during the last war. His widow must have married again, an American soldier with whom she left for America. Most likely the flag was part of their baggage and was separated from it when it was no longer found useful. This is I believe the most reasonable solution to explain this long trip.

The letters RF are the initials of the Republic of France.

The golden metallic fringe decorates most of the French official flags.

I will add that the flag of the draftees is present at all the presentations to which they are called to take part; national holidays, parades, visits to military graves, etc.

Also, they call conscripts (draftees) all the young boys called to military service at the age of 20.

The class of 1922 were very surprised to find their dear flag so far away. All their attempts to find it had been in vain. They thank you sincerely for having respectfully taking care of their flag.

It obviously would be happy for them to see the flag travel again to Blainville before 1962 to celebrate their 60-year birthdays.

Would you agree to send it to us? Will you let me know the price of the postage? I will send it to you so that you can proceed with the mailing.

Also thanks to your two students who will long be remembered for their discovery.

It's a pleasure to read your letter, and with my repeated thanks—please accept, sir, my most respectful greetings.

Mr. AUDIBERT,  
Mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, Coun-  
selor General.

Under date of November 17, 1961, I received a letter from Frank H. Klein, executive director of the Long Beach Island Board of Trade, and quote from it as follows:

I am enclosing herewith two copies of a letter received from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, France. As you will note, one copy is in French, the other an English translation.

This letter is a reply to a communication sent by our French teacher, here at the Long Beach Island Consolidated Elementary School, in reference to a flag found by two students, on the bayfront in Ship Bottom, N.J.

As you will note from the tone of the mayor's letter, the flag seems to be of quite some sentimental value to the men of his community and they are anxious for its return.

In my humble opinion the return of the flag with appropriate ceremonies might well be the means of building another bridge of friendship between the people of France and the United States down at the grassroots level. It would most certainly be a fine experience for our future citizens here at the local school.

My thought at this point would be for us to have a luncheon here at Wida's in Brant Beach, at which some person representing the French Embassy would receive the flag and promise to return it to its rightful owners. Or perhaps the presentation could be made in the school auditorium with lunch either before or after the ceremony.

I am sending the mayor's letter in the original French for your use in interesting the Embassy in the matter, should you think the project worthwhile.

On the receipt of this letter I contacted the French Embassy here in Washington sending them copies of the letter from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau and arrangements were completed for the delivery of the flag to M. Pierre Gabard, consul of France in Philadelphia, and the date selected was January 25, 1962.

The ceremonies were started at a luncheon held at Wida's Restaurant in Brant Beach on the occasion of the weekly meeting of the Rotary Club of Long Beach Island and I quote from the official minutes of that meeting as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

As predicted last Thursday was quite a day, one of the most heartwarming in many a moon. The sun shone from a cloudless sky, there was no wind, the temperature hit 50° F., and many of the flags that had been sold for our scholarship fund flew along the boulevard. And because two bright lads from the Ship Bottom Grade School had found a French flag on our beach and taken it to Miss Joan Singley, their teacher—

1. Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS drove up from Washington because, as he stated, the finding of the French flag seemed to him "an act of God."

2. French Consul M. Pierre Gabard came from Philadelphia to receive his flag and return it to its owners in France.

3. Freeholder A. Paul King came from Toms River to enjoy the occasion.

4. Reporters and photographers came from four newspapers to record it all.

Representative JIM AUCHINCLOSS told us the episode would be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remain there forever as a bright moment in international friendship. To honor the occasion he brought with him to present to the grade school the national flag which had flown over the Capitol in Washington the previous day.

Miss Joan Singley told the story of how the flag had been found and brought to her by the two boys.

Monsieur Gabard told us of the flag's significance. It belonged to a class of conscripts of the year 1922. It had been sought by the survivors of the class to be displayed, as was customary, at a reunion on their 60th birthdays.

Dick Van Dyk presented each of the two lads with a \$2 bill.

Sea Dog Tom Bossert suggested our Rotary banner accompany the flag to France. All agreed.

For this day Frank Klein must be thanked. He perceived this opportunity to advance international understanding. He brought it into being. So, Frank, thanks from all hands.

After the luncheon the meeting was continued in the gymnasium of the Long Beach Island Consolidated School and I

include herewith an article appearing in the Asbury Park Press on January 26:

#### LONG BEACH TOWNSHIP.

The ties between the United States and France that have existed since the American Revolution were strengthened yesterday by an auditorium of grammar school children, two young boys, a French teacher, and the French consul in Philadelphia.

The story started several months ago when the two boys, Vincent Scall and James Walzak, both 11 and both fifth graders at the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, were walking along the Barnegat Bay beach.

Vincent and James spotted a bag floating in the water. They recovered it and found inside a flag with some French words on it.

They knew it was French because they studied the language in Miss Joan Singley's class at school. They took the flag to her. She traced it to the 1922 class of military draftees from Blainville Sur L'Eau, a town in France.

#### FLAG RETURNED

Yesterday, in a ceremony at the school, the flag was given to Pierre Gabard, French consul at Philadelphia, for return to Blainville Sur L'Eau.

The auditorium of children made their contribution at the ceremony. They opened the program by singing the "Star Spangled Banner" and the "Marsellaise," the French national anthem, and closed it by singing two French children's songs they had learned in class.

M. Gabard, obviously moved, grasped Miss Singley warmly by the hand at the program's end. He had told the auditorium of children, teachers, parents, and members of the Long Beach Island Rotary Club:

"I know these two young men are good citizens because they have respect for the flag of another country. In the name of France and the mayor of Blainville Sur L'Eau, I thank you from the bottom of my heart."

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, who had arranged with the French Embassy in Washington for M. Gabard's appearance, told the audience the return of the flag was nourishment "to that friendly feeling that has always existed between this great country and France."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS then presented School Principal Warren Hickman with the U.S. flag which flew over the Capitol Building in Washington on Wednesday.

"You can well cherish the meaning of this day for a long, long time," Mr. AUCHINCLOSS told the children.

Earlier in the day, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS had addressed a Rotary Club luncheon at Wida's Brant Beach Hotel.

How the flag came to be in Barnegat Bay is not certain, but Miss Singley learned this much from Mayor Audibert of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau:

Each class of draftees has its own flag to be used in memorials and other ceremonies. A guardian is picked to keep the flag. The guardian for this particular flag was killed in action during World War II.

Some American soldiers were billeted in the guardian's home after France's liberation, and the mayor guessed the flag might have been presented to one of them as a souvenir. In any event, he wrote, the men of the class—all of whom will be 60 years old this year—were pleased to hear their flag had been found and would be returned to them.

M. Gabard went away with another flag, too. Ralph H. Reynolds, Rotary Club president, presented him with one of the club's own flags.

At the school ceremony, Vincent told of finding the flag and James recited its history.

Vincent is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Scall, 510 Central Avenue, Ship Bottom. James is the son of Mrs. Pauline Walzak, 8 West 64th Street, Ship Bottom.

I conclude these remarks with the translation of a letter dated February 8, 1962, I have received from M. Gabard as follows:

#### FRENCH CONSULATE,

Philadelphia, February 8, 1962.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,  
Member of the House of Representatives,  
Congress of the United States, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: I permit myself to write you this letter in French because I know all the interest you have in my country and her language; you proved it at Brant Beach and Ship Bottom.

I was very honored to make your acquaintance on the occasion of the simple ceremony—but how moving—of returning to France a tricolor flag belonging to the conscripts who are now 60 years old.

As you very well said, our two Republics have already been sisters for a long time, and for a long time, as I said, I have been acquainted with American good will. It will remain for us all an important pledge of peace and liberty.

I thank you infinitely for the \$10 bill, which I have sent in the form of a check to the mayor of Blainville-sur-l'Eau. I am certain that the old men of the class of 1922 will appreciate your generosity and your amiability toward them.

In the hope of receiving you soon at Philadelphia, I pray you to accept the assurance of my high consideration.

PIERRE GABARD,

Consul of France.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, February 16, to file a report on H.R. 10050.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure and satisfaction that I offer this joint resolution to the House.

As one of the sponsors of the several bills to provide medical care for senior citizens, I am particularly concerned with the pressing need for action in this area. Over 50 million Americans are either approaching or included in senior citizen status. Medical advances in recent years have made it possible for the average person to expect to live to a ripe old age. In view of this fact, we are now faced with the distinct obligation to explore ways and means of helping to insure that these additional years will be useful, productive, and healthful.

Our older citizens still have an invaluable contribution to make to our na-

tional well-being. The enormous potential which they possess as a group must be put to good use. These individuals deserve to be recognized as needed and worthwhile on the domestic scene as face the American people in this generation.

The needs of our senior citizens are great. Older men and women are frequently discriminated against solely because of their age. For this reason, and by reason of the financial inability which often accompanies the later years of a person's life, many of them are forced to live in substandard housing and to suffer the ill effects which this condition invariably brings.

Employment opportunities for the elderly—even those in good health—are extremely limited. It is ironic that medical science has prolonged human life only to create the problem of chronic unemployment for the older age group. Well-planned vocational retraining and a positive approach to the problem of job placement should be of the highest priority.

While the previously mentioned problems are of great importance, the most pressing issue and the area in which there is the greatest need is that of medical care for senior citizens. I shall not attempt to review the desirable features of this legislation or to argue its merits. These things have been done by me and other Members before both the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House. I would like only to remind the House of the great need which exists—here and now—for the prompt enactment of this program. We should not and must not fail in this important task. It is my sincere hope that medical care for senior citizens will become a reality before the end of this session of Congress.

I would also like to make special mention of the fact that my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, has introduced an important bill for the benefit of our older citizens, H.R. 10014. This farsighted measure would create a U.S. Commission on Aging and authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons. In my opinion, this is excellent legislation, and it deserves favorable consideration by the House.

May this resolution authorizing the designation of the month of May as Senior Citizens Month remind all our people of our obligations to the senior citizens of our country which, in effect, are obligations to ourselves and future generations as well.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include appropriate material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to be asked to head such a program as this one in celebration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am both proud and gratified to take part in it. To do so is to be identified with the finest motives of mankind. For the Lithuanian tradition is one which from antiquity has been marked by courage, devotion to ideals, development of civilizing influences, respect for one's fellowman, and the pursuit of liberty.

It is the mark of a great people, of great strength of character individually and collectively, that the Lithuanians have been able to emerge from the vicissitudes of centuries as a people distinct in their identity, determined in their preservation of high standards, undaunted in their faith in the future, and indomitable in their quest for freedom. Had it not been for such fortitude, such perseverance in the face of odds, the maintenance of high values, and such insistence upon liberty of thought, the Lithuanian people might long since have succumbed to the inundations of foreign forces to which they have been subjected over and over again in the course of their long history.

The present deplorable state of political dominance of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is by no means a hopeless situation. If we but look at the past record of these indomitable people, we can look to the future with hope and confidence. For theirs is a history of repeated emergence from the onslaught of their enemies, and an emergence not as a cowed and beaten people, but as proud Lithuanians unconquered in spirit and undivided, despite the temporary plight of their mother country.

More than once has the nation of Lithuania occupied an important place on the map of Europe. Though the independence which we honor today dates from 44 years ago, when the Lithuania of the 20th century became a democratic republic after World War I, that day in 1918 was not just a beginning. It was a rebirth of a nation.

Lithuanian history is a long and splendid one, though troubled. The Lithuanian people were known to Tacitus, who wrote of them in the first century of the Christian era. They can trace their identity through their language, which like only the Basque, in continued purity predates that of all of the other countries of Europe. Lithuania as a nation dates from the Middle Ages, when it was the dominant state of central and eastern Europe. History records it as divided into many principalities in the year 1009. But by the 14th century it was an entity stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the year 1386, through the marriage of the thrones, Lithuania and Poland were

joined together. Two centuries later these countries were officially joined by parliamentary action. The union lasted until 1795, though Poland twice suffered partition before then.

The development of Lithuania and Poland was far superior to that of the rest of eastern Europe politically, socially, and economically. Lithuania was one of the first countries of Europe to embrace Christianity. Respect for the individual, a corollary of Christianity, developed early, and the Lithuanians enjoyed more human freedoms than did their neighbors in countries on either side of them. In the general development of European civilization their part was an important one.

Because of their powerful independence and their superior culture they were able to protect Europe from the eastern hordes of Mongols and Tartars, at the same time withstanding for centuries the German drive to the east.

It was in 1795, at the time of the third partition of Poland that Lithuania fell prey to the domination of Russia. Repeated attempts to throw off the Russian yoke were unsuccessful during the 19th century. But equally unsuccessful were the tsarist efforts at russification of the Lithuanians. After a century of vain attempts to repress the Lithuanian spirit, to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with that of Russia, the policy was abandoned in 1905. While Lithuania remained politically a part of Russia until the Russian revolution of 1917 and the emergence of the new states after World War I under the policy of self-determination of peoples, the heart of Lithuania had never been conquered.

Nor was it conquered when invasion from Germany followed upon Russian withdrawal. Nor yet when, with Germany conquered, the Red army of Russia returned to install a Communist government. When political independence was finally a reality, it was to remain undisturbed only until World War II, when first German and then Russian invasions were renewed.

Despite, though, all ravaging and occupation of their country, the Lithuanians have never been conquered in spirit. They are an intrepid and indomitable people, and their independence will survive as it has for a thousand years survived. Lithuanian Independence Day is a day of triumph and of promise.

At this point, I take pleasure in inserting a series of gubernatorial proclamations designating February 16 as Lithuania's Independence Day.

The aforementioned proclamations follow:

#### GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATIONS DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 16 AS LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

##### STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Persons of Lithuanian birth or decent, living in the United States and elsewhere in the free world, are leaders of the effort to liberate Lithuania from the Communist occupation it has endured for more than 20 years.

To these people, February 16 is a date of great significance since it was on that day in 1918 that Lithuania became an independent

state, and remained so until it and other Baltic nations fell under Soviet domination.

To call attention to the desire of the Lithuanian people themselves supported by all lovers of freedom everywhere, for a return to return to their independent status, Friday, February 16, is designated as Lithuanian Independence Day.

May the observance of this event inspire us to turn an attentive and sympathetic ear to the appeal for justice which comes from within Lithuania.

May the time be near at hand when Lithuanian Independence Day can be celebrated openly in that country itself, as it is here by those who recall the days when Lithuania was free.

#### STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania occurs on February 16, 1962; and

Whereas this 44th anniversary will be observed by Americans of Lithuanian birth and ancestry and friends of Lithuania everywhere with suitable commemorative exercises; and

Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this anniversary in the name of free peoples everywhere: Now, therefore,

I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Illinois and request the appropriate observance of the occasion.

#### STATE OF MARYLAND

Whereas the people of Lithuania were deported, enslaved and mass-murdered by Communists; and

Whereas their religion was repressed and their freedom obliterated; and

Whereas a liberty-loving nation is not easily shackled, particularly when that nation has known the experience of freedom; and

Whereas the plight of Lithuania is known to all of us, and we cannot, as Americans, take a casual view of the loss of freedom of any nation; and

Whereas those whose ancestors came from Lithuania, and their friends of all national origins, join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism: Now, therefore,

I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, the 44th birthday of Lithuania's independence, as Republic of Lithuania Day in this State, in recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom.

#### STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas Friday, February 16, 1962, marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, that once free and proud nation now humbled under the yoke of Soviet oppression; and

Whereas from 1918 until 1940 this small nation displayed the exemplary characteristics of maturity, political stability, and social growth; and

Whereas despite the invasion and annexation of Lithuania in 1940 by Russia, the people of this indomitable country retain their fervent hope that liberty will once again be restored to them; and

Whereas the United States has refused to recognize the annexation of Lithuania and deplores the continued suppression of human rights by the Soviet Government; and

Whereas the citizens of Lithuania should be given inspiration to carry on their fight for liberty and justice: Now, therefore,

I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day and urge the citizens of Massachusetts to pay tribute to the oppressed people of this brave nation.

#### STATE OF NEBRASKA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Lithuanian Council in Vilnius on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas Lithuania, during a score of years of independence, demonstrated her ability to advance, grow, and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life; and

Whereas Lithuania, with her sister Republics of Latvia and Estonia, and first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprise the world of the aims and techniques of communism; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated our sincere devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania: Now, therefore,

I, Frank B. Morrison, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby proclaim Friday, February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day throughout Nebraska and commend the day and its significance to the patriotic consideration of all our citizens.

#### STATE OF NEW YORK

The inhabitants of Lithuania are a proud people with a history of many centuries of independence. Toward the close of the 18th century their land was brought under complete domination of the Russian czars. During more than 120 years of Muscovite misrule, the Lithuanians never accepted their defeat as final, never gave up their struggle.

With the collapse of the German armies at the end of the First World War the Lithuanian people seized the opportunity and their National Council, on February 16, 1918, issued a declaration calling for the reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis. Heroically they fought off an attempt by the Bolshevik government to reestablish the Russian yoke.

During the country's brief period of freedom, the Lithuanians maintained a government based upon equality of opportunity for all, a government which won the respect of the entire world.

This happy period of freedom ended in 1940 when by force of arms and under conditions of characteristic brutality, the Soviet suppressed Lithuania and forced it into the Soviet bloc.

We are fortunate in having among our citizenry, many Americans of Lithuanian origin. They are among our most valued neighbors and true friends. It is fitting that we join them in expressing the hope that the people of the land of their fathers may once again be freed of their bondage: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day in New York State.

#### STATE OF OHIO

Whereas February 16, 1962, will be the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of a free and independent Lithuania;

Whereas Lithuanians all over the world are celebrating February 16, 1962, as a memorial to a once free Lithuania; and

Whereas Lithuanians in America are observing this date by reasserting their belief in freedom for all people and reaffirming their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where we believe in and courageously struggle for liberty; and

Whereas Americans, citizens of a free Republic, have a warm and instinctive sympathy for the aspirations of freedom-loving people in other lands; and

Whereas citizens of Ohio of Lithuanian origin and descent have made a fine and substantial contribution to the growth and welfare of the State of Ohio: Now, therefore, I, Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day in Ohio and urge all the citizens of this State to join with those of Lithuanian descent in appropriately and suitably noting this date and the great significance which it has, especially for the Lithuanian people.

#### STATE OF OREGON

February 16, 1962, will be observed in many areas of the free world as the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Although presently this once-free country is behind the Iron Curtain of totalitarianism, I would hope that throughout America those citizens of Lithuanian descent and others who are concerned with the cause of freedom throughout the world may, through appropriate observances, recognize the continued need for support of those liberty-loving people of Lithuania who are prevented from observing this national holiday in their Soviet-occupied homeland.

#### STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the council of Lithuania formally declared Lithuania a free and independent Republic; and

Whereas Communist Soviet Russia, despite treaties and agreements, has suppressed and forcibly violated the political and territorial liberties of Lithuania and neighboring Baltic nations; and

Whereas Lithuanians and their neighbors were scattered and destroyed by murder, exile, and imprisonment in concentration camps; and

Whereas there is the fervent hope that Lithuania will regain her liberties and rights as a member of the world community. Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent state; and

Whereas Pennsylvanians of Lithuanian descent have contributed in many ways to the welfare and strength of this Commonwealth: Now, therefore,

I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day, and I call upon all citizens of the Commonwealth to join with our citizens of Lithuanian descent in the observation of this important anniversary and to mark the occasion with appropriate ceremonies.

#### STATE OF TEXAS

February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

While for the last 22 years this nation has been under the domination of Soviet Russia, the nearly 1 million freedom-loving Lithuanian-Americans annually observe this day when Lithuania obtained its freedom in World War I.

It is appropriate that Texans of Lithuanian descent be joined by their fellow citizens in marking this observance and continuing to work for freedom in Lithuania and other independent countries which have fallen under the heel of Russian communism: Therefore,

I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate February 16, 1962, as Lithuania Independence Day in Texas.

#### STATE OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the 16th of February marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of inde-

pendence to the more than 700-year-old Lithuanian state; and

Whereas although the Lithuanian nation has been under the oppressive tyrannical rule of Communist Russia since 1940, the love of liberty and independence continues to burn brightly in the hearts of Lithuanian people; and

Whereas all the people of Wisconsin and the Nation are in deep sympathy with the plight of this oppressed country: Now, therefore,

I, Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day and pay tribute to the heroic Lithuanian people who have struggled against so many odds for the peace and freedom of their beloved country.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

We are proud to observe with you Lithuania's Independence Day. We certainly hope that this observance will be successful throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who chaired the famous Katyn Massacre Committee of several years ago, upon which I had the honor of serving. We investigated here and all over Europe the massacre by the Communist Russians of thousands of Polish officers during the war years; and thus we struck one of the great blows against this evil.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are again commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence which marks the 44th time which the people of Lithuania and their friends do honor to that eventful day in the history of that liberty-loving nation. The Lithuanian people for 800 years have at intervals enjoyed freedom and independence and regrettably on too many occasions have the people of Lithuania been compelled to live in virtual enslavement under control of more powerful neighboring nations.

During the 18th century, this nation was under the tyrannical yoke of Russian tyranny for over 120 years. But during this time against terrific odds, the Lithuanian people launched five major revolts against their conqueror. At each interval during its history when Lithuania enjoyed free government, its leader demonstrated outstanding leadership to rule and legislate for its freedom of all its people.

World War I brought about an international situation which gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to proclaim to the world that it was a free and independent nation. For more than 20 years as a free country, no nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, enacted social legislation, and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world. This great progress by a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of a powerful aggressor nation who succeeded in enslaving its people.

I have on former occasions spoken on the floor of this House outlining the infiltration duplicity and force used by

the Communists to submerge Lithuania and I shall not repeat these sordid facts today. I can only say that the people of Lithuania will not be alone in their fight for freedom against the Soviet tyrants. Millions of others are today temporarily held under the yoke of Communist tyranny. They, along with the free nations of the world, including the United States, must keep up the fight not only to curtail the expanse of communism but to wipe its tyranny from the face of the earth and restore liberty and independence to the valiant and heroic people of Lithuania.

Back in the 83d Congress, I was a member of the special committee on investigating Communist aggression and particularly as it pertained to the Baltic States. That committee took the testimony of over 200 witnesses and recorded hundreds of exhibits at hearings held in the United States and Europe. This committee did major service over the period that it was holding hearings to expose to the world the unlawful and barbarous methods used by Stalin, Khrushchev, and other Soviet leaders in enslaving Lithuania and other small nations surrounding its borders.

Our colleague, Congressman DAN FLOOD, who has reserved this time today to honor the Lithuanian people was also a member of that committee and contributed major service to the successful findings exposing Communist aggression.

As a Member of the House Rules Committee during the last two sessions of Congress, I have fought within the committee to report favorably on the floor of the House the pending resolutions to create another special committee for the purpose of further exposing to the people of the world true facts, methods, purposes, and international crimes committed by the Communist leaders in their long ranged program to enslave the world under Communist tyranny. I do hope that we can get favorable action in this session of Congress on the creation of a Special Committee for Captive Nations. I have this week introduced House Concurrent Resolution 418, asking the Congress to condemn the false and oppressive persecution against all religions not only in Lithuania but in other satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. Other Members have introduced similar resolutions and I do hope that we can get favorable action by the Congress on this concurrent resolution during the present session.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 418 along with my remarks commemorating Lithuanian independence.

Whereas the atheistic governments of the Soviet Union and the captive nations of international communism have directed their forces toward the complete destruction of all religious worship and other liberties; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in January of 1962 by the Government of Lithuania represents the latest oppression of religion in the Communist bloc nations; and

Whereas the false charges upon which such prosecution is maintained may indicate a final program by the Government of Lith-

uania to eliminate the Catholic priesthood in Lithuania; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in Lithuania may demonstrate a growing campaign throughout the Communist bloc of severe persecution of all peoples who believe in God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress condemns the false and oppressive prosecution of Roman Catholic priests by the Communist Government of Lithuania and the Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of Congress, I have cosponsored a concurrent resolution which I have this week introduced in Congress asking for the creation of a committee to investigate these various countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], with whom I have served in the 83d Congress as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, will agree with me, that it was the leaders of Lithuanian folks in this country who were responsible for the creation of that committee. Hearings were held not only in this country but throughout Europe, during which we took the testimony of some 250 witnesses. The publicity from the committee's hearings was sent to nations over the globe revealing some of the startling international crimes committed by Stalin, Khrushchev and other leaders of the Soviets in their efforts to enslave Lithuania and other nations. Although 8 or 9 years have now passed, the effects and results of the work of that committee have been valuable in informing millions throughout the world of the true tactics of communism.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has appeared before the Rules Committee on a number of occasions, along with other Members, asking for the approval of a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. As a member of that committee, I have fought on behalf of those resolutions to get favorable action so that this Congress may be authorized to investigate the methods used by Communists in keeping the satellite nations enslaved. I hope that in this session of Congress the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be acted on favorably by the Rules Committee. I shall make every effort to get favorable action by that committee so that we may establish a special committee to investigate the Communist enslavement of captive nations in this session of the Congress. The people of the world should know the history of Soviet aggression in the satellite nations, including Lithuania, and the methods used in keeping the people of Lithuania and other people under enslavement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I am grateful to the gentleman from Indiana. He has recited well the history of our experiences in special investigations of committees of this House dealing with the Communist menace. I was especially pleased to hear him refer to my pending resolution now before the Committee on Rules calling for a special committee again for the investigation of the captive nations, which has struck a chord all throughout this Nation. I hope and pray with him that the Committee on Rules will see fit to report out this resolution so that this committee can be established once more and again show the world the weight of this body on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who has worked with me this session mainly to point out that this is a bipartisan approach or a nonpartisan approach, if you will, to the subject and who has helped me greatly in our efforts to create the Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his forthright statement here today on the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I also commend him for his tenacious fight through the years, not only for the enslaved people of Lithuania, but the millions of others who are trapped today behind the Iron Curtain. It certainly has been my privilege, for the short time I have been in the Congress, to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for legislation which would create a committee in the House—the Special Committee on the Captive Nations—to investigate the facts and the evidence of the peoples who are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. He certainly is to be encouraged and commended for his fight has been a long and a hard one. But it has been a consistent one, and I hope that within the near future it will bear fruit here in the House of Representatives.

I can think of no more fitting commemoration of this anniversary of Lithuanian independence than for this House to establish the Captive Nations Committee to give voice to the struggle that these valiant people have withstood in the past 22 years. Too long this gallant little nation has suffered the domination of the Soviet Union. Her people yearn to be out from under the yoke that has suppressed them at various stages over the centuries. They want to determine their own destiny through a government and a way of life of their own choosing. To say that they chose Soviet tyranny would be to make a mockery of the free elective process which is held so dear by those who have experienced it.

Though small geographically, Lithuania possesses a great cultural tradition totally independent of the monster to the east which seeks to eradicate all significant singular characteristics of its conquered nations. This is but one of the crimes committed by the Soviet Union when she brings down her reign of terror upon another nation.

Today, through our commemoration, we attempt to shine a ray of hope

through the Iron Curtain into Lithuania. We proclaim our friendship for her people and our intention to one day see them free.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Massachusetts is, as usual, most kind, and I, of course, hope that he will get his wish.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] who last year had the honor and the privilege of sharing this exercise.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for giving me this opportunity to speak today in paying tribute to Lithuania. I also want to commend him for the many years that he has handled the Lithuanian hour in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is a particular honor to take part in these exercises marking the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. During the Middle Ages Lithuania was a great and powerful nation. She successfully turned back the invasions of Germans, Mongols, and Tartars. Finally, in 1795 she lost her freedom to czarist Russia. After that there were many attempts by the Lithuanians to throw off Russian domination, but they were tragically unsuccessful. After the third revolt, which took place in 1831, the czarist government initiated an attempt to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian. This merciless and repressive policy was intensified after still another revolt in 1863, but the Lithuanians refused to give in to the overwhelming power of the foreign dictator and remained faithful to their language, religion, and traditions. The policy of forceful russification was abandoned in 1905, and the Lithuanian refusal to accept the full weight of Russian rule remains an example for all peoples who are under the ruthless Russian dictatorship today.

In 1915 Lithuania was overrun by German armies, and Russian domination came to an end. The cost of the First World War to the Lithuanians was great, with first the retreating Russians and then the Germans seizing or destroying everything that could be of use. In 1917, in response to Lithuanian pressure, the German Government authorized a gathering of 200 Lithuanians to discuss the possibility of Lithuanian independence. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. The defeat of Germany, combined with Russian revolution, gave the tiny Lithuanian people an opportunity to fulfill its ancient yearning for real independence.

But the hopes of a long suffering people were not so easily fulfilled. Less than a year after the declaration of independence whose anniversary we are celebrating today, German troops evacuated the city of Vilnius and the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. In 1920 the Red army was driven out by the Polish Army led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and Lithuanian fighting units. Having no other alternative, Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent

nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty.

But as is so often the fate of small countries the brute power of larger neighbors proves to weigh more on the scales of history than the rightful aspirations of the people, even when these aspirations are recognized in formal treaties. Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania, and a permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922, granting the Lithuanian people freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. But independence lasted only until 1939, when the Lithuanian people became one of the first victims of both German and Soviet aggression. In the summer of 1940 the Soviet Union engineered the establishment of a friendly government, which under Soviet pressure duly requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and the country was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Lithuania was overrun by German invaders, and when the fortunes of war turned against the Nazis, Lithuanians returned not to independence but to Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, we know that deep in the heart of every native Lithuanian there is a passion for liberty and freedom which will never die. There is no earthly power that can forever hold in servitude a God-fearing people who are determined to overcome the will of the tyrants. On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin to salute the Lithuanian people everywhere.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who I am pleased to say has done as much as anyone in the many years that I have been here to join me and others in fighting this kind of cause with any weapon at hand against communism. He has served on several of the committees which we have heard named. I am pleased that he will speak today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman and express my sincere congratulations and gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] who has taken this opportunity to enable his colleagues to have time to give their remarks and observations with reference to the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence by that once great, free, and friendly independent nation of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania as a nation had never, during the many centuries of independence and Lithuanian rule over vast areas of Eastern Europe, practiced intolerance or oppression in her relations with the nationalities inhabiting those areas.

Defending themselves and Europe from the Mongol invasion, and defending themselves from the Teutonic conquest, the Lithuanians had maintained magnificent traditions of neighborly collaboration with their friends and subjects on terms of cultural and political equality. The Lithuanian underground struggle for the freedom of the printed word in their own language, represented

the unique 40-year epic which ended in a Lithuanian victory over the czarism in 1904. Following the pronouncement of the 14 points by President Wilson in January 1918, the Lithuanians were the first Eastern European nation to proclaim their independence within a month thereafter—on February 16, 1918. Their declaration of independence, promulgated in the ancient capital city of Vilnius, referred simply to "the recognized right of nations to self-determination," and the restoration of the Lithuanian state.

Independence was not won easily. Even while fighting battles against the encroaching enemies, the Lithuanians held free elections in 1920 and promulgated a democratic republican constitution.

Peace was signed with Russia at Moscow on July 12, 1920, and the Soviet Union renounced forever any and all claims to the Lithuanian people and soil. Lithuania soon thereafter was admitted in the League of Nations and scrupulously observed her international obligations. Her Government was active in every major international peace undertaking, such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Litvinov definition of "aggression pact." Nonaggression and arbitration pacts with Germany and the Soviet Union seemed to guarantee Lithuania's independence. Her people were energetically raising their cultural standards and economic prosperity. By 1938 excellent relations were maintained with all the neighbors of Lithuania.

Lithuania did not deserve the cruel fate imposed upon her by the predatory action of Stalin and Hitler. Lithuania is perfectly justified in continuing to resist the Soviet Russian oppression and in demanding that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be honored. The Lithuanian people have earned liberation—and liberation must come ultimately.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania. I condemn the horrible crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Soviet Russian occupant in Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Again I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for introducing his resolution to create a Captive Nations Committee. What is lacking in this world, I think, is candor and courage and fortitude to present to the world the fact that the Russian Communists, as well as the Chinese Communists, have by their predatory action deprived God-fearing people of the right of national self-determination.

We as a Nation were born in revolution and it is up to us, upon whom the mantle of world leadership has been placed, to present forthrightly to the world and to the United Nations the true facts of world Russian and world Chinese communism and imperialism, and to demand that the Russian and Chinese Communists live up to the agreements which they have made. It is about time that we in Congress set up this Committee on Captive Nations, the reasons for which have been so clearly presented by the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Because other nations and because our representatives at the United Nations are unwilling to bring up resolutions demanding that the Russians abide by the commitments they have made in the United Nations, such as the General Assembly Resolutions on Hungary, I think it is up to the U.S. Congress to set up this Captive Nations Committee which will bring to light the terrible events that have occurred and are occurring behind the Russian and Bamboo Curtains. The world will then again know that the U.S. Congress stands behind Public Law 86-90 in its determination that all nations, large and small, must have the opportunity to exercise the right of self-determination.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I urge the Committee on Rules to approve the Flood resolution. This committee, if it is set up under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will be of inestimable value and assistance in the case of peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation which now suffers under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. We in the United States have never recognized the legality of this Soviet takeover and we look forward to the day when our country may resume diplomatic relations with a truly free and independent Lithuanian Government. It is fitting on this occasion, as we commemorate the independence of a brave, though small, nation to ask ourselves what it is that distinguishes our American position toward the Russian satellite states. Why do we urge, at every opportunity that is offered us, that the satellite states of Eastern Europe be allowed the right of freedom and independence? It is because we recognize and uphold the essential dignity of the human being wherever that dignity is imperiled.

Man has an inherent and inviolable right to the choice between good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong. When this right is destroyed, all our free civilization is endangered. National boundaries can no longer blind us to the dangers to ourselves when these rights are violated anywhere. It is for this reason that we call to mind today the search of the Lithuanian people for national independence and personal freedom.

The Lithuanian struggle for liberty has a long history. Five major revolutions took place during their 120 years under Russian domination from 1795 to 1915. The Napoleonic era saw Lithuanian volunteers unite to form nine regiments to fight for the liberation of their country. The defeat of Napoleon, however, brought an end to the provisional Lithuanian Government. Churches, schools, monasteries were abolished as Czar Nicholas decreed the policy of "Russification" that sought to turn Lithuania into a Russian province. Undaunted by previous failures, the Lithuanians again rebelled in 1863 and 1864, only to be crushed again with cruelty, Siberian exile, and forced emigration. In 1905, yet another revolt suffered the same fate.

Russian domination temporarily came to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by the German armies. And on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council adopted what may be called a declaration of independence. It called for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as capital and the severance of all political ties which had linked it with other nations. In 1920 the new Soviet Communist government agreed by a treaty to recognize the "self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania." This was the pledged word of the Soviet state that was broken when it suited the Communist dictators a few years later. Observe the words carefully. The treaty said that the Soviet Union renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

These events appeared to herald the birth of a long and glorious life of freedom for the Lithuanian people. Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in September 1921. Sweeping reforms were initiated within the country. At the head of the list was land reform, a subject of intense interest throughout the world today. Before World War I approximately 450 families in Lithuania owned 3½ million acres or 22 percent of the land. Within a few years the new democratic government of Lithuania had made possible the establishment of over 45,000 new farms and more than 200,000 persons had been provided with regular jobs and permanent homes through agrarian reform. The nation flourished. In the 10-year period before World War II grain production increased almost 100 percent and there was a 15-fold rise in the butter output of this rich farming country. Industry and transportation increased as Lithuania moved forward in freedom for the first time in more than a century. Progressive social legislation was introduced. The 8-hour day was instituted and provisions made for medical care of the rural people. Tremendous changes took place in the field of education. In 1920, for instance, there were only 9,000 students in high schools; by 1939 the number had doubled. Progress was even greater at the grammar school level where the number of students rose from less than 72,000 in 1920 to almost 300,000 in 1939. During this time Lithuania became a modern nation.

World War II shattered all this progress as Lithuania became Russia's first victim in the holocaust. By means of threats and intimidations Russia extracted a so-called 15-year mutual assistance pact from Lithuania. But this was merely a smokescreen for Soviet annexation. On June 15, 1940, which is a day of infamy in recent Lithuanian history, Soviet troops occupied the land. With the exception of the 3 years of German occupation during the war, the Soviets have been there ever since.

Americans may well be proud of their relations with this courageous occupied country. The U.S. Government and its citizens made important contributions to the attainment of Lithuanian independence. During the First World War

the 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson, notably the principle of self-determination, brought inspiration to Lithuanians in their struggle for independence and facilitated their winning of independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent, who are fine Americans, have continued to furnish moral and material support to their friends and relatives at home. And I would emphasize again that the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania.

During World War II President Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain and issued a declaration of policy which has continued to be a true expression of the principles upon which U.S. policy is based. In the Atlantic Charter we pledged "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." May we soon see the day when those words are realized in Lithuania.

Nationalism, the desire for freedom and independence, is one of the most potent forces in the world today. But we sometimes forget that nationalism is not restricted to the colonial areas of Africa and the Far East. The people of Lithuania also want and richly deserve their freedom. In fact, their passion for self-determination may be even stronger than that of the colonial peoples because there is no freedom in Lithuania today, whereas there is in most African colonies. Soviet Russia poses as the friend of nationalism and the enemy of imperialism. But her continued subjugation of Lithuania is a living refutation of these Soviet claims. Let Khrushchev give the Lithuanian people their long-denied freedom before he again sings the praises of anti-imperialism. It is well to remember this today when we pause to honor the birthday of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania must again become a free and independent nation dedicated to friendly progress and cooperation with the citizens of the free world. And we pray that the arrival of that day may not be prolonged. Until then let us help to nourish the defiant hope of liberty that burns within the hearts of the people of Lithuania.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join once again in this annual observance of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a sovereign nation. This independence was ruthlessly destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940, and since that sad time, the people of Lithuania have been existing under the yoke of an aggressive foreign power which they detest and abhor.

In 1940, the Soviet Union repudiated its treaty obligations with this small and helpless neighbor, invaded the country by armed might and forcibly took over the government. It acted similarly against Lithuania's small neighbors, Estonia and Latvia.

Throughout these past 22 years, these little states have been exploited as mere colonial possessions of a ruthless Communist dictatorship, which is completely foreign to the ideals and aspirations of these defenseless peoples.

We observe this anniversary of Lithuania's former independence in order once again to bring to the world America's sympathy for these subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Let us ring out the message that we have not forgotten them and we shall never condone the deplorable action of the Soviet Union in denying these peoples the right of self-government, independence, and freedom.

As in other Communist-ruled nations in Eastern Europe, Lithuania and its small neighbors are ruled by the force of the Russian Army, their guns, their tanks and the secret police. They are the victims of intolerable oppression. They long for the day when they shall again live in the sunlight of liberty and independence.

The people of America join in their determination that this day will eventually come.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence for Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates elected a 20-member council which proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

Lithuanians were not fortunate enough, however, to be permitted to enjoy the blessings of freedom for any sustained period of time. Almost constantly since their proclamation of independence, the Lithuanian people have suffered under German occupation or the oppression of the Soviet Communist invaders. Under Communist domination, Lithuania has turned into a slave state, and suffered the loss of thousands of its citizens through execution or deportation to Siberia.

U.S. policy toward the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania has never changed. The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the former independent Government, which has a Legation in Washington.

The words of the late U.S. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, marking the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the declarations of independence of the Baltic States, clearly reflect the attitude of this country today with regard to the method by which these countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. The statement read:

The United States was quick to denounce this aggression and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 we take cognizance of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and today we are reminded that 44 years have passed since these brave people originally broke the shackles that held them in bondage.

Twenty-two years ago the Russian colossus moved in upon the Baltic States and gave a demonstration to a war-occupied world of how coldblooded a totalitarian power can be when bent on world domination. The brave Lithuanians, in particular, since that hour of aggression have given all liberty-loving people everywhere an example of adjustments that must be made in the face of naked tyranny and there is evidence, despite the proximity of the U.S.S.R., that the spark of liberty still burns brightly within the breasts of these courageous people.

Americans sitting in the comparative security of the Western Hemisphere are too prone to accept the Baltic situation as something that does not concern them. Indeed, the fact must always be taken into account that when liberty is denied any race of people anywhere it can quite possibly threaten our own peace and security. Among us today are many brave sons and daughters of Lithuania and their hearts bleed for their compatriots who are held in thrall by a ruthless conqueror. In this day and age when we are taking a forthright stand against colonialism let us not lose a single opportunity to point to Russia as the greatest colonial power in history. And on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us pledge our military, economic, and moral resources to the eventual liberation of this great people so that they can once more assume their rightful place in the commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is a particular appropriateness in the fact that the session of the House of Representatives began today with a prayer by a distinguished visitor, the Reverend Dr. Vaskas, instead of by our own Chaplain, for it set the theme for the speaking of what is on the minds of many of us today as we take notice of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, which took place on February 16, 1918.

The free world is sad because Lithuania today is not independent. But even while the Kremlin pretends to the world that Lithuania and her Baltic sister republic, Estonia, are full-fledged Socialist states in the Soviet Union, the whole world knows—and to Russia's disgrace—that these and other states that ought to be free and independent are mere colonies of the Russian colonial empire, the largest but most constricted colonial empire that exists in the modern world.

For as long as I have been a Member of the Congress, I have participated in observances such as this, in recognition of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Much time has passed, and unless one has the opportunity to be informed as to real happenings behind the Iron Curtain, we might feel that we have been contenting ourselves with uttering empty words about the hopes which we have for the liberation of the Lithuanian people and for their early arraignment as an independent nation in the family of free nations.

There are stirrings in Lithuania, difficult though it may be for the people

even to maintain their language, their religion, their culture, and, indeed, in many instances, even life itself. Here in our own country there are stirrings too, that at the strategic time can have an important effect upon events which will mean independence again for Lithuania.

If it is among the many fine Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in my own district and in the districts of many of my colleagues, that these stirrings are most in evidence, that is only to be expected.

Through them, in their day-to-day relationships with their neighbors and fellow citizens, they can stimulate the interest of the American people as a whole. Such interest, as has been proven a number of times in our history, notable examples of which are Ireland and Israel, can be the most potent instrument in helping friendly but subject peoples to gain or regain their independence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

I wish to join with my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania who are striving to regain their freedom and national independence.

While the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny rests upon the shoulders of the Lithuanians today, their spirit has not been suppressed. The Lithuanian people, and Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, can take great courage in the fact that the free mind of man has always conquered the tyranny of an aggressor.

History rests on the side of the free world and of the people of the captive nations who are striving for freedom. But history is shaped by men. Hence, we must again pledge ourselves to the goal of a better world where all peoples will live in peace, freedom and justice. And we must continue to direct our actions to this goal.

I am confident that the American people will continue in their efforts to hasten the arrival of the day when the people of Lithuania, and the peoples of the other captive nations, will throw off the oppressive yoke of communism and once again resume the role of free and independent nations.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence provides freemen with two vital opportunities:

Again, it gives us a chance to express with all the people of Lithuania—both those enslaved in their native land and those who fled to freedom—our conviction that the force of righteousness will give Lithuania a new declaration of independence.

Second, it provides us with a telling chance to remind the world again that the Soviet Union is history's greatest and harshest enslaver of free people.

On February 16, 44 years ago, the proud and free nation of Lithuania marked its Independence Day, climaxing a statehood of liberty extending back to the year A.D. 1200.

In 1940, however, a long night of enslaved darkness fell on Lithuania and

her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. The Soviet Union tore up treaty commitments, invaded Lithuania and imposed its force upon her.

Since that time, Lithuanian freedom and independence have been suppressed by the Soviet Union and the nation has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation.

But Lithuania has not been forgotten. Her spirit, her people, and her history of freedom burn brightly today in the minds of her children and her friends everywhere. The world will not forget and some day Lithuania will again be free.

In its present state, Lithuania has for the world a message in addition to that of freedom—a message of warning.

In an age when new nations are emerging by the dozens, the people of the new nations should remember Lithuania when the cynical salesmen of Soviet slavery appear on the scene. Far too many of these new nations seemed swayed by the spurious Soviet claim of anticolonialism when in fact it is the most vicious colonial power of all history.

I would strongly recommend that the case of Lithuania and its neighbors have a permanent place on any U.S. agenda for negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As the world's greatest free republic, the United States will not forget its friends in Lithuania and the smoldering fire of freedom that they personify.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this February 16 will be the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. But there will not be the rejoicing that such an occasion usually brings. Instead the day will be observed by solemn ceremonies, for the great expectations with which Lithuania declared its independence were dashed in 1940. Soviet Russia's treachery stamped out the liberty of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, scattering their peoples to the far corners of the earth. Yet, in the face of great suffering and cruel disappointment, the Lithuanians have continued to keep their hopes and courage high. Burning with idealism, those fortunate enough to escape the iron yoke of Russian oppression are constantly working toward regaining freedom for their brothers forced to live as captives in their Soviet occupied and dominated homeland.

The free world joins in commemorating the birth of Lithuania's century-old dream of freedom and pledges itself to advocating the continued censorship of Russia's colonization of the Baltic countries—the free world retains the firm belief that self-determination and freedom will once again return to the Baltic coast.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Each year we in the Congress recognize the 16th of February as a day to pay tribute to this proud and courageous nation. As we know, in the late Middle Ages Lithuania was a powerful state, and in the years following the First World War she was an enlightened and progressive republic.

However, in the 1940's she was destined to fall prey to the totalitarians of left and right Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. Since then she has come upon days of sorrow. Despite all the horrors they have undergone, the sturdy Lithuanian people have not lost heart. They are determined never to accept Soviet domination as their ultimate destiny. They have not been broken and there remains hope within their hearts of a new day of redemption.

Let this day, therefore, be a constant reminder to the people of the United States of the evils of communism; let it also be a symbol of the meaning of courage. To the courageous people of Lithuania goes our fervent hope that true freedom and independence will come.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration of independence for any country is a heartwarming and thrilling occasion but this 44th anniversary celebration of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a time of special significance. During these years the real heart of Lithuania has been glorified by the loyalty of its people to the highest standards of freedom and independence and their determination to exercise their will in the interests of peace and justice. The spirit of such a people can never be cowed or broken no matter how ruthless or how coldblooded the onslaughts of the godless ideology of communism may become. It is altogether fitting and most appropriate that we here in America who cherish these things should remember and draw inspiration from the example of the Lithuanian people. By their example they give us courage and renew our determination to guard our own heritage of liberty handed down to us through the years. May we ever remember these wonderful people and do whatever we can to bring about their liberation from the yoke of slavery and once again bring peace and righteousness among their people.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a happy and yet a solemn occasion. It is happy for us to contemplate the days when Lithuania was a free nation, when its people knew independence. It is solemn, for we must then bring our thoughts to the present time and the fact that another year has passed since we marked this anniversary and the people of Lithuania are still living under the hobnailed boot of the Soviet army.

Let us raise the torch of freedom a little higher and hope that its flame can be seen from behind the Iron Curtain. Let us reassure the people of Lithuania that our thoughts and prayers are with them on this anniversary. Let us work and hope for the day when a new independence anniversary for Lithuania can once more be marked.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuania is a small nation but it has suffered greatly at the hands of Soviet imperialism. Its people still languish under the Soviet imperial power today. They deserve our recognition and our

support for continuing to maintain their integrity and their hope for the future in the face of the overwhelming might of the Red army.

Let us look for a moment at the record of this small nation of brave men and women. It shows conclusively that the Lithuanian people recognize themselves to be a nation and have consistently fought for their right to self-determination. And when Lithuania achieved its independence in the years between the two World Wars it quickly proved to be a modern progressive state. The continued Soviet occupation of Lithuania, therefore, is a case of raw, unvarnished colonialism regardless of what the Communist propagandists may say.

From the late Middle Ages and almost to the end of the 18th century—from 1385 to 1795—Lithuania was united with Poland and formed one of the great states of central and eastern Europe. But in 1795 Poland was brutally carved up and Lithuania was seized by Russia. From then until 1917 she remained a Russian province. But on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed the political independence of their country and realized the ideals cherished by all Lithuanians for more than 100 years. In 1920 Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all its former rights of sovereignty. Let us observe the words of this treaty for they validate Lithuania's right to be free and show the full depth of the later Soviet treachery. The treaty stated:

In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all people have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

The next 20 years saw a period of progress and of achievement in Lithuania. Following the World War, Lithuania made up for the lost time brought about by the foreign invaders. The government took the initiative in land reform and social legislation. Improvements in transportation and education were diligently pursued. The advancements made by the new republic would certainly serve as proof that Lithuania was capable of governing its own affairs and that national sovereignty had been long overdue.

This period of freedom with all of its precious liberties came to an abrupt end for the courageous Lithuanians. After achieving an admirable record in re-establishing their free nation on a firm footing, they were again threatened by Russia. The treaty of 1920 was conveniently forgotten by the Communist dictator, Stalin. In 1939 the Soviet Union violated Lithuanian sovereignty by signing a secret agreement with Nazi Germany turning over to the Nazis certain territory belonging to Lithuania. Despite these ordeals Lithuania opened her doors and offered assistance to the

Polish refugees who came pouring across her borders after the fall of Poland. But the forced mutual assistance pact doomed the Lithuanians to Soviet domination. This pact provided that military bases for Soviet troops were to be established in Lithuania. From that time to the present the brave people of Lithuania have been subjected to the Soviet Union.

In the case of the Soviet Union we are faced with the greatest hypocrisy of the century. It poses as the friend of oppressed peoples everywhere, but refuses to give freedom to its own colonies like Lithuania. Make no mistake about it, Lithuania is just as much a colony of Soviet Russia as Angola is a colony of Portugal. Today world public opinion is incensed over the terror and mutual slaughter in Angola. And, indeed, opinion should be aroused over these events, for they are tragic. But where are the cries against Soviet imperialism in Lithuania and the rest of Eastern Europe? I do not hear the new and resurgent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America complaining about this Soviet imperialism. They are concerned with their own problems and seem to care little about what happens in Europe. But I say today that if the neutralist nations continue to disregard the lessons of Eastern Europe they will do so at their own peril. Whenever the Soviet Union can win control of a foreign government it will do so. And it will use whatever means it possesses and that appear to be effective in the particular situation. Let us not continue to permit the Soviet Union to masquerade as the friend of the poor and the oppressed, and the enemy of colonialism. Let us tell the world over and over and over again of the treacherous Soviet hypocrisy.

Hear, if you will, what Khrushchev said about colonialism to a group of Indian newspapermen in 1958. He said:

Colonialists are people with rather low morals. In their public statements they appeal very often to God, and at the same time they keep their knives in hiding, ready to use against the weak in order to seize their riches—oil or other assets. Now the colonialists are raving particularly against the Soviet Union, and trying to discredit it in the eyes of the peoples. Why? Because they see that the Soviet Union has won great respect among the peoples, since its policy is based on high moral principles.

But I ask, What are these high and moral principles that underlie Soviet policy? The Soviet record in Lithuania makes it plain that they are neither high nor moral, but low and immoral. They are the old principles of grab and plunder, only now they are dressed up with the fiction of "peoples democracies." Let us not permit the world to forget this truth.

Today we pause to honor the brave people of Lithuania and we will continue to do so until they have once again become independent. But this celebration has an even broader significance because it is one more instance when we can remind the world of what Soviet "anticolonialism" really means. Lithuania is the living proof that Soviet "anticolonialism" is really a mask for

the most vicious brand of colonial imperialism of the 20th century.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be one of the speakers at the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day which was celebrated on January 21, 1962, in the common council chambers, city hall, Buffalo, N.Y.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address which I delivered on this occasion:

#### UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Today marks the 44th anniversary of modern day Ukrainian national independence. After several centuries of occupation by the Russians, the Ukrainian people seized the opportunity made possible by World War I to declare their national independence. By this act, the people of Ukraine expressed their determination to be then and forever free of the imperial chains of Moscow. This was an act, a political act, which served notice on the peoples of the world that Ukraine was dissolving the bonds which connected them with the empire of the czars. More than that, it was an affirmation of the long held aspirations of the people for national independence, national identity and a rightful place in the world community of sovereign nations.

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to those patriots who led the fight for that independence, those who made the supreme sacrifice in this cause during the long twilight before 1917, those who led the way during the struggle of 1917-18, and those who continue to carry on the fight in Ukraine today. This is an unbroken chain of sacrifice, of dedication and of courage, which the new leaders of the Russian empire have come to know and fear. A people with this determination and national purpose cannot long be denied their aspirations for freedom.

Ukraine is no more a legal and voluntary part of the Soviet Union than it was a legal and voluntary part of the empire of the czars. Those who claim that Ukraine is a traditional part of the Soviet Union demonstrate their profound ignorance of the facts of history. And those who claim that it is undesirable for the U.S. Government to advocate the peaceful dismemberment of the Soviet Union, by advocating national independence of Ukraine, are taking us down the road to national disaster. Since the beginning of our Nation we have defended the right of all people to be self-governing. We have expressed this policy by our support for the principle of self-determination. In doing so we have acted in concert with our own Declaration of Independence and in keeping with our rich heritage as a self-governing people. Every time we have taken the bold initiative to support this universal principle we have been acclaimed by the common man the world over. When we have faltered in support of this principle, which thank God has been a rare exception, we have earned the distrust of the oppressed and brought crisis and calamity down upon our backs. Here the record of our national behavior is clear for all to see, who want to see the truth in its stark reality.

President Kennedy has said that we are living in the revolutionary age, that we are the legitimate children of the greatest political revolution in the history of the world. He has made it clear that we do not fear revolution by those who are oppressed and exploited just as he has made it clear that our basic goal as a nation is "a peaceful world community of free and independent states." This was the keynote theme of President Kennedy's state of the Union message given before Congress on January 10 of this year. I will support the President to the limit of my abilities in the winning of that objective. In doing so, I am confident that I serve the highest interests of our Nation

as well as the hopes of the people in all the captive nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

This is a most suitable occasion for me to pay a well-deserved compliment to the members of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week. This committee, established to support Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, has attracted national attention during the past 2 years. The work of this committee as a trail blazer in educating the public to the cause of the captive nations and the vital role they are playing in thwarting the Kremlin's plans for world conquest has won the acclaim of the national committee and similar committees established throughout the United States. Others are following the fine example you have set. Buffalo is an acknowledged leader in this fight for peace with freedom and justice for all nations and people. You are to be congratulated for this show of leadership.

But much remains to be done. The tidal wave of self-determination is sweeping the world. As President Kennedy pointed out in his address before the United Nations, "the crest of this wave is yet to hit the Communist empire. You and I know that no amount of propaganda, or no Iron Curtain, no matter how high or how deep it may be, can contain the human power of that tidal wave. The empire of the commissars will fall before this tidal wave, just as the old empires in Asia and Africa have been dissolved by its political power. You and I can hasten that happy day by standing firmly by our American traditions and ideals and supporting all who aspire to freedom and national independence. This is what the people in the captive nations expect of us. This is the formula for peace in our times."

The day is not far off when Ukraine will regain its national independence. That happy day will see all the captive nations returned to their rightful place in the family of nations. Let us move forward to that objective in the strong conviction that human freedom is the wave of the future, believing as we do that the death knell of tyranny and despotism has sounded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Yet as we mark this day, the 3 million Lithuanian people who fought to obtain freedom at the end of World War I are perhaps further from that goal than ever before in the history of that nation.

As daily we work to halt the onslaught of the Communist menace in countries in this hemisphere, we scarcely have time to reflect on those captive nations in Europe where there is no longer an obvious struggle going on between the Red masters and their targets for tyranny.

Yet this struggle still does proceed as millions of freedom-loving people in the world are forced to live under the yoke of totalitarianism. Since that fateful day in June of 1940, when the Communist Russian hordes invaded Lithuania and forcibly incorporated it in the U.S.S.R., the spirit of these people has never been broken.

During the Second World War the Lithuanian people formed an active underground force to resist the Communist occupation. As late as 1949 the first Secretary of the Communist Party, speaking before the party congress, revealed that although 12,000 resistance fighters had been killed, the struggle was

still continuing. We are told that as many as 100,000 patriots were massacred before active resistance was finally suppressed. Although the Lithuanian people have not known freedom now for 22 years, their spirit of resistance to the Red tyranny remains to this day.

On this occasion of the celebration of Lithuanian independence, we join with the friends of Lithuania and the other captive nations of Europe to look forward to that day when the founding of a new Lithuanian democracy will take place, a democracy which will rise above and persevere beyond the tyrannical forces which now enslave it.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a day of solemn commemoration and tribute. It is the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence from Russia by the founders of the Lithuanian Republic. We celebrate it now with pride in remembrance of this event and with sadness at the realization of the present plight of this great and tragic country.

Although freedom and independence have been denied to them, the Lithuanian people have won the admiration of the freedom-loving nations of the world who include them among the most brave and stalwart fighters for justice.

Recently it was my privilege to join with several hundred Americans of Lithuanian descent at a rally in Waterbury, Conn., in observance of this anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

It was a colorful ceremony, rife with the undying spirit of the Lithuanian people, and stimulated by the presentation of folk songs and dances by boys and girls of Lithuanian lineage.

I was moved, in witnessing this program, to give assurance to this gathering that the U.S. Government and we of the House of Representatives would continue to strive for the day when all the Baltic nations would once again be free.

I saw neither desperation nor resignation in the words of Anicetas Simutis, vice consul at the Lithuanian General Consulate in New York, who told his Waterbury audience that while communism is being imposed on the people of the Lithuanian nation, there is a longing for freedom in their hearts. He also expressed the opinion that the Baltic nations "are lucky in having the strongest and most dependable ally in the world, the United States."

As we observe this solemn anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we fan the still-burning flame of freedom with words of encouragement and hope. We make no reckless promises. We do offer sympathy and encouragement to a nation of people with whom we join in prayer for a new era of freedom. Above all, we must determine to keep their plight and fate before the people of the world.

I yield to no one in my admiration for the people of Lithuania and their courageous and continuing struggle. I know the people of this race in my district as warm, personal friends and associates. They are sturdy people, self-reliant and dependable. They are factory workers and business and professional people;

musicians and politicians; merchants and men and women of letters. I am proud of my association with them.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we review the heights that have been attained through freedom and democracy, and the depths that have been plumbed as the result of oppression. The temporary enslavement of this proud race behind the Iron Curtain is the immediate concern of peoples of courage and determination in the free world. Our thoughts must be solemn as we contemplate the present plight of this once free nation.

I trust that the current efforts of the European Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the leadership of our colleague, Mrs. KELLY, will help markedly to dramatize the scope and acuteness of the plight of the captive nations. This committee is presently holding hearings to review the status of each of these tragic countries with the view to reexamining congressional attitudes toward this sad and difficult problem.

Our prayers and hopes on this anniversary date of independence are for the termination of the brutal slavery of the talented and courageous Lithuanian people.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is not a day of joyous celebration, for the independence which was proclaimed for Lithuania on February 16, 1918, has been denied by the Soviet Union since 1940. Instead, Lithuanian Independence Day is one of solemn commemoration of that nation's achievement of independence, a day of rededication to the cause of freedom everywhere.

Lithuania's achievement of independence in 1918 followed more than a century of domination by czarist Russia, a domination which began in 1795. Prior to this the history of the Baltic state is a long and proud one, dating back to the 11th century. During the Middle Ages, Lithuania was a powerful state which helped protect Europe against invasions from the east.

It is their long history as a nation, together with their distinctive language and culture, which provides assurance that their love of independence can never be eradicated. Just as the Lithuanian people in the past steadfastly rejected all the attempts of the czars to superimpose the Russian language and culture upon them, we can be confident that the Lithuanian people of today continue to long for free institutions to replace the totalitarianism which has been imposed upon them from Moscow.

On this 44th anniversary of their independence day, let us reassure the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten and that the United States will continue working toward the goal of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians, who in the Middle Ages and in early modern times had their glorious days, lost their status as a free nation toward the end of the 18th century. For more than 100 years they struggled to regain it. Finally, in 1918 they succeeded

in attaining their goal, proclaimed their independence, and established a democratic form of government. Under this government of their own choice they lived for more than 20 years, engaged in the task of reshaping a better life for themselves in their historic homeland. Before this self-imposed task was completed, however, the clouds of war descended over their country. The aggressors struck and in 1940 Lithuania as an independent state ceased to exist when the troops of Stalinist Russia invaded the country.

Since 1940 the Lithuanians have experienced the cruel tyranny of both Nazi and Communist domination. The end of the war brought no relief. In fact, since 1945 under the Communist Russians their suffering has been aggravated. Since then Lithuania has become a vast concentration camp for its liberty-loving inhabitants. Tens of thousands of Lithuanians have been deported to distant areas of the Soviet Union, and their homes have been given to new settlers from Asiatic Russia. During all these years the country has been practically sealed off from the free world, and of course no Lithuanian is allowed to leave the country.

In celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which unites the Lithuanian people with all peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in observing and commemorating the 44th Anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, we are doing so under the most unusual circumstances. The perpetrators of Soviet colonialism and of Communist dictatorship are making extreme efforts to exploit the Lithuanian nation and its resources while, at the same time, hypocritically offering their so-called friendship and brotherliness.

Knowing that they will not be able to destroy by force the Lithuanian yearning for freedom, and that they will not gain the trust and friendship of the Lithuanian people by compulsion, the Soviets announced a utopian program of progress and well-being, purportedly designed to surpass even the most advanced countries of the world.

Yet the actual situation in Lithuania has not improved. On the contrary, freedom of conscience has been further restricted and the Lithuanian people remain bereft of their basic rights and are exposed to misery as well as to a constant threat of being deprived of their right to remain in their homeland.

While the people in Lithuania cannot observe their independence day, Lithuanians in the United States and we in the free world can and do commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1962, marks the observance of the 44th anniversary of

Lithuania's declaration of independence, an independence only briefly enjoyed over a span of some 20 years.

Lithuania as a country is now held in Soviet bondage, but the people themselves will never be truly held in bondage. A free spirit is never daunted, merely dimmed by necessity until the moment returns when it may burn brightly and freely again.

Soviet tyranny and oppression hold forth at the present time in Lithuania and in other captive nations. The free world refuses to accept this situation as permanent.

This 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a reminder of the hopes of the free world that the millions of Lithuanian people may once more enjoy the fullest measure of freedom.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, once again this year, as I did last year, I am privileged to join my colleagues in saluting Lithuanian Independence Day.

On the 16th of February, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared themselves forever free from foreign rule. In this freedom—the first they had known in more than a century—Lithuania flourished in every respect. Agriculture, the primary occupation of Lithuanians then and now, developed at its most rapid rate. Industry increased 100 percent. Grammar and secondary schools mushroomed everywhere. Just labor laws were enacted. Literature and music blossomed out in forms and expressions more beautiful and more numerous than ever before.

But this prosperity, this Golden Age of Lithuania, was shortlived. Despite the Lithuanians' staunch resistance, they were conquered and occupied—first by the Russians, then by the Nazi Germans, and ever since World War II by the Russians again.

Under the Soviet Russians, the Lithuanians have suffered untold hardships. In the prewar period of Soviet domination, the Russians shipped Lithuanian intellectuals by the hundreds from their beloved homeland to the bleak Siberian wastes, and executed other Lithuanian patriots by the thousands. Since the end of the Nazi regime, the Soviets have refined their methods of oppression, but the degree of oppression has not diminished in the slightest. Now, instead of Russian overlords, Lithuanian puppets perform the acts governing Lithuania—but the Kremlin still pulls the strings.

During the most unbearable periods of oppression, waves of Lithuanians have fled their fatherland and migrated to the free nations of the Western world. They and their descendants have become responsible, productive citizens in the countries which they now call home. I will personally vouch for the industry and integrity of the many wonderful Lithuanian-Americans in my home district, the 10th District of Pennsylvania.

On February 16, all over the world, people who are rightfully proud of their Lithuanian ancestry will be commemorating this, the 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Those in the free world can and will extoll the merits of this milestone so that all may know and honor its significance. Those behind the Iron Curtain must celebrate in

silence. Let us speak out for those who cannot speak. Let us join Lithuanians everywhere in the fervent hope that Lithuania may soon wrest itself loose from the Soviet Union's crushing, crippling grasp, so that it may flourish as an independent nation once again.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of July, Americans at home and abroad manifest their appreciation of their cherished independence and freedom. Our celebration is without reservation and without hindrance.

Tomorrow is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence of the brave people of Lithuania. Tragically, there will be no public celebration by these people in their homeland. The restraint imposed upon them by a foreign power will prevent them from giving voice to sentiments such as we here in America do each year. Moreover, the independence that was restored to them 44 years ago has again been taken from them.

This does not mean, however, that the aspirations and hopes for independence are dead in the Lithuanian people. Those of them who are in the United States and other parts of the free world are commemorating this day and expressing the dreams of their countrymen at home. During their earlier subjugation by Russia they continued to foster their hopes and refused to accept foreign ideologies and customs. Now under the Soviet's dominance they still continue to look forward to the day when they will again be free, and in their hearts they are commemorating this anniversary of the earlier restoration of their freedom.

The U.S. Government has not recognized the subjugation of Lithuania—or of Latvia or Estonia—and many Americans are today remembering the plight of these people. We all hope that one day in the not too distant future they may be able to indulge in independence day celebrations just as we do here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for several centuries unhappy Lithuanians had lived under alien regimes. Late in the 18th century their country had become part of czarist Russia, and for more than a century they had suffered under the oppressive czarist rule. They had tried to free themselves many times, but all their attempts were unsuccessful. In 1918, when the czarist regime was no more, the Lithuanians felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year.

Thenceforth for more than two decades, until the outbreak of the last war, Lithuanians enjoyed freedom in their historic homeland and they made their war-ravaged country a happy haven for themselves. The war and subsequent events, however, not only robbed them of their freedom but placed them under the ruthless Communist Russian regime. Since 1940 these liberty-loving Lithuanians have lost their country, their freedom and nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still cling to the hope of regaining their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of their Independence Day let us hope that they attain their goal and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian descent and their kinsmen in other free countries will observe the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence on February 16. Unfortunately, their ancestral homeland has fallen under the yoke of tyrannical communism and is today one of the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

The people of Lithuania have not relinquished their desire for freedom and independence, and I am sure they never will. Their quest for freedom, however, must be kept alive and vibrant for their own sake as well as for the sake of the free world. They must not think of themselves as a forgotten people in this very dark moment of their history, for if they lose courage then they are really doomed to extinction. This is what the ruthless rulers of the Kremlin would like to happen, so that they can forever wipe out the small peoples.

It is extremely important that we in this country and freedom-loving people of other free countries should continue to focus the spotlight of world attention on the subjugated and oppressed status of the captive nations of Europe struggling under the yoke of Communist imperialism. We must do so in order to gain the offensive in the cold war. We must do everything possible to put communism on the defensive and to subject Russia to worldwide criticism and derision.

On this day of Lithuania's anniversary of independence we pledge our continued support and we join with our fellow Americans of Lithuanian extraction in prayer for the early liberation of their ancestral homeland and their kinsmen who live there.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago tomorrow, the Lithuanian National Council, on February 16, 1918, adopted a Declaration of Independence providing for the "reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis." Today, we commemorate the 44th anniversary of that memorable day in the history of Lithuania—a history that records the story of a suffering, yet courageous people, possessing an unquenchable will to freedom and liberty.

This land had been under the domination of its more powerful neighbor, Russia, for more than 120 years, but the determination of its people to stand as free men never wavered. The end of World War II gave the Lithuanians an opportunity, once again, to establish their own government. As a free people, they drove the Bolshevik invaders from their lands, and in July 1920 signed a treaty of peace with the Soviet Union, under which the Russians renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

During the short period as an independent nation, Lithuania became a full member of the international community of nations and won worldwide respect for its efforts to promote the social, economic, and cultural welfare of its people.

It was not long, however, before the Soviet Union rejected its treaty obligations, and despite its many declarations of respect for the independence of this

small nation, demanded in 1940 that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red Army be permitted to enter the territory of Lithuania. In this imperialistic manner, Lithuania was made a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

Although the yoke of communism hangs heavy in that land, neither the tyranny of oppressors nor time can erase from the memory of these people their glorious tradition of freedom and courage. We know that they cannot openly commemorate this cherished occasion, but we are sure that their faith in the deliverance of their nation and the restoration of their rights as human beings remains strong.

And so today, we rise in the Congress of this great and free nation to pay tribute to Lithuania and to the indomitable spirit of its people—a people who have so exemplified and fought for their freedom that they will never permanently accept the deprivation of their rights and of their human dignity. We rededicate ourselves today to the cause of justice and freedom for all men and reiterate our firm resolve to stand fast with all those who refuse to abandon that cause.

It is fitting also on this occasion to pay tribute to all Americans of Lithuanian descent who have made so vital a contribution to the strength and spirit of this country. I join with them in their prayers for the return of their homeland to the family of free nations.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania's 44th anniversary of independence is an inspiring occasion. It marks the survival of an ideal. It marks the survival of a people by virtue of sheer idealism and willpower, down through the ages. It marks the survival of independence of spirit despite oppression, extreme suffering, and repeated efforts at political extirpation. It marks the survival of hope.

The faith of the Lithuanian people in the eventual restoration of their country to its independent status is itself inspiring. Nor is this belief in some future revivification of Lithuania as an autonomous country merely a visionary dream without substantial backing. The history of the Lithuanian people and of Lithuania as a nation bears ample witness to the substantial basis for the conviction that the country will once again become independent. The Lithuanian people are among the oldest in Europe who have maintained their identity throughout all the changes of the centuries. The Lithuanian nation once occupied a large portion of the map of Europe. It was a powerful and highly developed state when the Russian regions around it were still barbaric. The people of Lithuania maintained their traditions and their individuality in spite of repeated ravaging from without. They emerged again as a nation after World War I. It is that independence which we celebrate today. And it is that independence as a nation which the United States has never ceased to recognize, despite Communist domination. On such a foundation rests the faith that Lithuania will ever endure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians will again commemorate one of their anniversaries. On that day, these hardy and independent-thinking people will celebrate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of their independence. The Lithuanians have not lost their taste for freedom, it has only been dulled for a time by a harsh deterrent, the Soviet Union—the aggressor who took over this little country as well as Latvia and Estonia, somewhat as a big bully dominates and rules smaller neighbors. This enslavement by force by colonial Russia will never kill the love of freedom living in the hearts of the Lithuanians. This flame of the love of liberty will live on forever.

The Lithuanian American Information Center at New York has made a number of very timely comments on the subjugated Lithuanian peoples, and I would like to insert in the Record, Mr. Speaker, this brief statement:

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1962

The people in Lithuania under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union cannot observe their Independence Day, but Lithuanians in the United States and the free world can commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

In 1940, the Soviet Union tore up treaty obligations with Lithuania, perfidiously invaded Lithuania and by force imposed its will on the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania's freedom and independence were suppressed by Soviet Russia and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since. It is ironic that Eastern Europe countries with centuries of culture behind them should be colonies of the Soviet Union just as Asian and African countries are emerging from colonialism.

However, despite the long enslavement, Lithuanians in the old country still have an invincible will for freedom.

Lithuania is not a "new" state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200; she has a splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial, linguistic and cultural liberty. She has every right to freedom and independence.

Our Government and other governments through their delegations at United Nations should declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and agents from Lithuania, to return all Lithuanians from exile in Siberia, prisons, slave labor and concentration camps and demand free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents.

The subject of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States should be brought up at any forthcoming negotiations with the Kremlin rulers and at international conferences.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues and the many friends of Lithuania in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

There can be no real joy in the observance of this anniversary, for we know that the people of Lithuania, now subjected to the tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia, are prohibited from observing it.

After many years of sacrifice, Lithuania was finally in a position to declare her independence to the entire world on February 16, 1918. She was not permitted to enjoy freedom very long; in June 1940 her territory and institutions were unjustly seized by Soviet Russia and since then her people have suffered persecution and tyranny. Our sympathy is extended to them and to the many Lithuanian Americans who deplore the enslavement under which their kinfolk in Lithuania must live.

We know that the ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200. Lithuania achieved an enviable historical record of tolerance, of individual and cultural liberty. During the short period of their independence and before being brought under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union, the people earned the admiration of all democratic peoples for their high ideals, industry, and courage.

Once again we salute the brave people of Lithuania. We extend the hand of friendship to them. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The cause of Lithuania is just and righteous; we maintain that she is entitled to her freedom. We hope and pray that the day is near when her independence will be restored to her.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The people in Lithuania, now under the iron heel of the Soviet Union, cannot observe their Independence Day, but we can join with Lithuanians in the United States and the free world in commemorating this event for these subjugated people.

Forty-four years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania declared herself to be free of Russian domination. The small Baltic nations of Latvia and Estonia joined Lithuania in this gallant action, and all three nations formed democratic governments and made excellent social and economic progress in their brief years of freedom.

But, in 1940, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania and subjugated the three Baltic States. Lithuania's freedom was suppressed by Russia, and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since.

Despite their long enslavement, however, Lithuanians in the old country are keeping alive their desire for freedom. They have not lost hope for ultimate victory, and the indomitable spirit of the people lives on.

We must continue in our refusal to recognize this forcible seizure of Lithuania. To keep alive the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere, we must continue to strive for the restoration of independence to the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian national anthem closes with the words "May our land ever stand peaceful and united." Tomorrow, on the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence we are reminded that this pledge remains unfulfilled. We join with the brave Lithuanian nation, not only in celebrating the

anniversary of their freedom, but in expressing the hope that the day may not be too far away when Lithuania will once more stand free, peaceful and united.

After a long period of czarist rule, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence on February 16, 1918. This act marked the realization of a goal for which this sturdy people had been striving ever since the Russians took over in 1795. But when the retreating German troops left the city of Vilnius in 1919, the Red army entered and set up a Communist government. The Lithuanians were able to realize their aims only after they joined a Polish army and drove out the Soviet forces. The perfidious Russians signed a treaty which "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." Yet only two decades later, after being occupied by the invading Germans at the start of the Second World War, this suffering nation was again occupied by the Red Army and fell under Russian domination. Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R., although this act of wanton aggression has never been recognized by the United States.

Thus vanished the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania. But the loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. The Communist regime has not been able to subdue and suppress the ancient spirit of freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people. This is the only bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we hope and pray that the Lithuanian people will soon have freedom to enjoy life in their historic homeland.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, an independence which was achieved after more than a century of foreign domination. Farther back in its history, during the Middle Ages, Lithuania had been a powerful sovereign nation. However, it had entered into a union with Poland and, in 1795, when Poland was partitioned for the third time, had been annexed by Russia.

Lithuania remained under czarist domination until 1915 when World War I brought first merely an exchange of Russian rule for German rule but, ultimately, also brought independence. During 1917 the German Government authorized a congress of Lithuanians which elected a 20-member council. It was this council which proclaimed an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

The two decades during which Lithuania was independent were marked by trials as well as joys. No sooner had the German army evacuated the capital of Lithuania than it was overrun by the Red army. A year of fighting was required before the Soviets were driven out and Russia signed a peace treaty recognizing Lithuania as an independent nation and renouncing forever all rights of sovereignty. In the Second

World War Lithuania experienced the aggression of both the German and the Soviet armies. At the end of the war, in blatant violation of the treaty of 1920 in which Russia recognized Lithuania's independence, the ancient nation was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thus Lithuania today is one of the captive nations in the Soviet empire. However, by their long experience with foreign domination, for the most part Russian domination, the Lithuanians are well equipped to retain their identity, their culture, and their love of freedom in spite of all Soviet efforts to force them into the Communist mold.

We in this country commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence as a salute to the valiant people of Lithuania who must live behind the Iron Curtain without an opportunity to enjoy the freedom for which their ancestors struggled so long and finally won. We commend the million Americans of Lithuanian descent for their contributions to the growth of our own country. Finally, on this occasion we rededicate our efforts to the task of building a world in which some day all men and women can live in freedom and dignity.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the ebb and flow of history many nations have wielded great power only to decline in time to a lesser rank. In the days of its greatest power, Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and covered over 350,000 square miles of territory. It was a Lithuanian-led force, which together with Polish, Russian, Czech and Tartar allies crushed the Teutonic knights at Grunewald in 1410.

But the Lithuanian people do not regard their past military prowess as their true glory. Rather it is to their independent Republic that they look back, a republic which managed to maintain itself for 22 years on the chessboard of Europe as a model of progress and enlightenment.

This Republic was proclaimed 44 years ago, on February 16, 1918. It was the climax of the Lithuanian movement for self-determination, a movement that had been suppressed under the Russian czars, who had ruled Lithuania since 1795. With the disorders in Eastern Europe following World War I, it took some time for Lithuanian territory to be cleared of foreign troops, but once its sovereignty was established, the Lithuanian Government compiled an enviable record. Land was distributed to the peasants, industrial production increased, great progress was made in transportation, health, and education. In its international dealings Lithuania displayed an open and friendly attitude. Unlike some other small European states, it was not puffed up with false pride. It allowed its record to speak for it.

But Lithuania paid a price for its international decency. In 1938 it was forced to accept a Polish ultimatum to recognize the cession of Vilnius, which Poland had seized 15 years before, and in 1939 the Nazis seized Memel, which had been awarded to Lithuania by international agreement. The Lithuanians felt compelled to fall back upon the Soviet

Union for friendship and protection, and now suffered the greatest betrayal of all. For with Soviet troops garrisoning much of the country, the pressure on Lithuania became intolerable. With the opposition largely under arrest, a plebiscite was held on July 14, 1940, and Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The day after hostilities broke out between the Germans and the Russians the Lithuanian population rose as one man, and once again declared its independence. But once again popular hopes were dashed, as the Germans showed no disposition to recognize Lithuanian aspirations, but treated the country as conquered territory. When the Russians swept back into the country in their 1944 offensive, Lithuania disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

But the Lithuanian people have not accepted the fate meted out to them by their Communist masters. Officially they may be citizens of the Soviet Union, but unofficially—in their hearts—they are citizens of a free and democratic Lithuania. Soviet persecution and despoliation have not broken their spirit. Terrorism and brainwashing, the carrot and the stick, have not altered their determination to regain their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Republic we salute their brave resolve.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania is celebrated on February 16, but the ruthless Soviet dictators are still depriving the Lithuanian people of their freedom. What the Soviet Union has been unable to take from the Lithuanian people is its exalted spirit of liberty. Like the Russian czars who tried to impose an alien way of life on this sturdy little nation before World War I, the Soviet rulers have learned that it is easier to dominate a people by the brutal controls of a police state than to make them forget a historic tradition of independence. As time passes the free world more and more appreciates the devotion that Lithuanians in exile have for their native land, and by their persistent and continued efforts their flame of independence is kept a bright and shining example to all nations that cherish freedom.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin who yearn for national independence with political and social justice. Lithuania wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and I am convinced that the people of America are inspired and thrilled at such patriotic devotion. May we join with these courageous people in hoping that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuania is not a new state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to 1200 A.D. Their freedom was lost in 1795 and not regained until 1918. From 1918 until 1940 Lithuania enjoyed freedom. Then, in 1940, the Soviet Union dis-

carded treaty obligations and invaded this small country and the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. They were compelled to become a part of the Soviet Republic. In the years since, the people have endured oppression, slavery, and exile. It is a well-known fact that many citizens of these little countries have been in exile in Siberia, in prisons, and in slave-labor camps.

It is appropriate for us to pause here today to pay homage to the brave people of Lithuania. Lithuanians have contributed a great deal to the culture and welfare of Europe. Lithuanian-Americans have made great contributions to this country. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Russia. In commemorating Lithuania today, we reaffirm our belief in freedom and our opposition to Soviet oppression. We pray that the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will regain their freedom.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with my colleagues in this observance of the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. At the same time, it is my hope that one day soon we may be able to celebrate the freedom of Lithuania and the end forever of the imperialist domination by the Soviet Union which exists there today.

This coming Sunday, the Lithuanian-American community in my home city of Rochester, N.Y., will gather once more in commemoration of Lithuanian independence and I look forward eagerly to being with them on that occasion. I have said before that many of us whose roots are buried deep in this country often do not appreciate our freedoms as do those who have known what it means to be denied the precious fruits of liberty. And so I look forward to renewing acquaintances with my Lithuanian-American friends, to whom freedom means so very much, and to joining with them in their solemn prayers for the early liberation of their homeland.

As we join together today in this observance, I hope that we can rededicate ourselves to the cause of Lithuanian independence and reaffirm our intention to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to secure the release of the Lithuanian people from the bondage of the Soviet Union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 44th anniversary of the independence of a small but brave nation, Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have no independence today and are not even permitted to celebrate this anniversary of an historic event. But these speeches in the halls of the U.S. Congress will serve to remind the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them. And they will serve to remind the Soviet Union that we have not forgotten its imperialistic enslavement of the Lithuanian nation for these last two decades. It is indeed fitting that we should honor this anniversary of Lithuanian independence each year until independence has once again been achieved.

Soviet Russia has laid down many lines of propaganda which it pursues with fanatic zeal. But none has been more

consistent and vitriolic than the charge of colonialism and imperialism which it has leveled against the United States. Khrushchev hopes to create in the minds of the Asians and Africans the image of the Soviet Union as their champion; that the Soviet Russians were in fact the leaders of all the forces opposed to colonialism; that they themselves stood as the perfect example of the spirit of anti-imperialism. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is the living refutation of these Soviet claims.

For centuries Lithuania had been an independent nation. But it was her misfortune to be absorbed into the old Russian Empire at the close of the 18th century. When World War I ended, however, Lithuania won her independence and succeeded in establishing an independent nation. And Lithuania prospered for two decades. In every way—economic, social, political and cultural—the Lithuanian people demonstrated to the world their ability to govern themselves. But on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union violated its treaty commitments with Lithuania and the Red army moved in. Without provocation or justification, and in utter contempt of international law, the Soviet Union overran the independent Baltic countries and installed regimes deliberately organized to obliterate the new-found freedom of these peoples. Is this the record of a country that is the champion of anticolonialism? No, it is not. Let the record be spread before the world to see in order that the Soviet Union's pretensions of righteousness may not go unchallenged.

We want the citizens of Lithuania to know that the people of America and of the free world have not forgotten Lithuania's glorious history of independence. The free world will never complacently accept Soviet occupation of Lithuania. And we will continue to hope that the national independence won 44 years ago will be recovered and that Lithuania will again be free.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, it is fitting for this House and for Americans everywhere to pause to pay grateful tributes to the gallant people of Lithuania and their noble heritage.

For centuries, the Lithuanian nation struggled for freedom and the advancement of democratic ideals and it is well to remind the world of the unconquerable spirit and outstanding contributions of the Lithuanian people to the cause of freedom and independence. Here in our own great land the sons and daughters of Lithuania have made conspicuous and outstanding contributions to the defense, the development, the welfare, and the protection of this nation. Their impressive culture, their inestimable gifts of loyalty and their richly constructive citizenship have contributed immeasurably to the advancement and glory of our own great country.

In hailing the cause of free Lithuania, let us not forget the cruel fate that now afflicts the unhappy Lithuanian nation. The oppression that the Lithuanian people suffer is not confined to Lithuania alone, but encompasses the Poles, the

Latvians, the Rumanians, the Serbs, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slavs and many other free peoples who are victims of the callous brutality of the slave state and Red oppression.

The anguished people of Lithuania, stirred by poignant memories of a happier day, are unable to observe their Independence Day. Let us today here in America and let free peoples everywhere commemorate this anniversary for them.

At the same time, let it be known on this anniversary day that the American people stand by Lithuania and other oppressed peoples who are the victims of confiscation, aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny. Let us give hope and inspiration to the helpless and the oppressed by encouraging the forces of freedom in the world.

Long live free Lithuania.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest racial groups in northeastern Europe. For centuries they had constituted their own independent state and lived there happily, but late in the 18th century their country became part of the Russian Empire and they unwilling subjects of Russian czars. But these stouthearted people were never reconciled with their unhappy lot, and when the czarist regime was overthrown in 1917, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Thenceforth for about two decades they lived happily in their homeland and enjoyed the blessings of freedom and democracy.

World War II was disastrous to the Lithuanians. In 1940 they were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. After suffering under Soviet communism for a year, their country was overrun by Nazi forces; then early in 1944 the Red army returned once more, and it has been there ever since.

Thus on the 44th anniversary of their independence day unhappy Lithuanians find themselves sealed off from the free world in their homeland, but they still cling to their hope of regaining their freedom. On their independence day our wholehearted sympathy goes to these gallant people.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked in the hurly-burly atmosphere of today's world. We have much to learn from the Lithuanian people, and it is good that we remember our debt of gratitude to them.

The Lithuanian people have given us an inspiring example of devotion to freedom. This independence day signifies their continuing love of liberty, although they had fallen victim to Hitler's armies, and now find themselves under the oppressive boot of Khrushchev's military forces. They still have not given up the hope of regaining their independence in the face of what presently appears to be almost overwhelming odds. Lithuanians have died before in their fight for freedom, and they are no less prepared today to give their lives in the name of this noble cause. Can we do less?

We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to

our every action. If the Lithuanian people are willing to die for the freedom which they presently are denied by their Communist masters, we, too, should be ready to make sacrifices to preserve it. We are grateful to them for showing us the way. It is a pleasure to honor their courageous spirit on this independence day.

The American people hope that the freedom-loving forces within Lithuania will not be disheartened in the future struggle against Communist tyranny. Let them know that we stand by them; that we are making every effort to check Communist imperialism; that we are actively working for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose the life which they deem best. Lithuania has successfully asserted its independence before. The continued celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day indicates that they will again take their rightful place in the sun of nations.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we turn our thoughts to the countries under the domination of the Soviet Union on the anniversaries of their national holidays. We are ordinarily concerned in this House with the unsolved political, economic, and social problems of the United States. Without minimizing our difficulties in living up to the highest ideals of our country, I would like to suggest that directing our attention regularly to the plight of the captive nations helps us to place our own problems in the proper perspective. There are no more brutal police states in the world today than the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. It is a sobering experience indeed to consider the human suffering which continues to exist behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is unknown and the full force of Communist totalitarianism reigns supreme.

Today we commemorate the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence in Lithuania, a once powerful nation which suffered for over a century under the ruthless domination of czarist Russia. On February 16, 1918, a group of 200 Lithuanian leaders assembled to consider the future of their country, which at the time was occupied by Germany. Like our own Founding Fathers, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed their independence fully conscious that they would have to redeem their pledge with their own blood. When the German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Russian forces were driven out by Polish and Lithuanian troops, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty renouncing all future rights to Lithuania, and the steadfast Lithuanian people embarked on a regime of freedom and independence. But the era of Lithuanian independence which we recall today was not destined to survive, in a world which is ruled by force of arms rather than peace treaties. At the outset of the Second World War the long-suffering Lithuanian people were invaded by Nazi Germany, which after causing immeasurable human and material damage was

driven out by the equally ruthless dictatorship of the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian state was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R., an act which the United States has never recognized. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we are united in hoping that the future will bring a better life to the Lithuanian people and fulfill their ancient desires for freedom and independence in their historic national home.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Baltic nation of Lithuania. With my good friend and colleague, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, I join in paying a personal tribute to the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain and the American citizens of Lithuanian descent in our own land.

On last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the American-Lithuanian Society of Washington, D.C., at their annual event commemorating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It was an honor for me to be the guest of the society and to receive the warm and cordial greeting from Mrs. Barbara Darlys, president of the society, and from other members and guests.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the address which I delivered at this inspiring event.

It is a great honor and privilege to be with you today to help celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Those who have come from that land to the United States have contributed much to the progress and to the strength of our own great Nation.

In my own congressional district we have some, but not many, American citizens who claim Lithuania as the homeland of their fathers. We are very proud of these fellow citizens because of their high cultural, moral, and spiritual standards, and the part they have played in the progress of our community.

In the Congress of the United States you have many friends and supporters of your ideal of freedom for your fatherland.

As a people you have a rich history, a glorious past, and a love of freedom. You have suffered the tragedy, not only of Soviet oppression and tyranny, but czarist rule and slavery as well.

Despite the long and enduring struggle for freedom in your fatherland, you have kept the faith and the determination to be free. That the spirit of freedom and national independence can still burn so brightly after years and years, generations and generations, of cultural and physical oppression is a tribute to the strong character of the Lithuanian people. It gives hope to all of us who share the Christian faith and love of freedom that liberty and justice, and not Communist and totalitarian tyranny, is the wave of the future.

You are to be commended for your faith and confidence in the future. Some of our own American citizens who are confused and overwhelmed by the almost insurmountable problems which we face could profit by your determination and efforts.

To look with suspicion and distrust on our own Government and its leadership creates disunity and unwittingly helps the Communist conspiracy.

President Kennedy understands the Communist threat. He has given our Nation and the free world new faith and confidence. I share with the President his philosophy that social reform is an effective weapon

in wiping out the conditions under which the Communist seed takes root and grows.

Khrushchev and the Red legions of China are ready to push forward at every break in our ranks. Dedicated agents of the international Communist conspiracy are now busily at work in Laos, in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Africa, and in every underdeveloped area of the world. Where arms can be used, they are employed. Where guerrilla warfare works better, it becomes their major weapon. And where the slow but steady subversion is required, that becomes their tool of destruction.

The Communist challenge is a total one, employing not only military means, but economic, propaganda, political, and ideological weapons as well.

There has never been a time in history when free men and women have needed to think more seriously about the past and use their historical knowledge to chart their course in the fight for freedom.

It would be wise for those of us who are here today to take a moment from our festivities and consider the deep historical significance which the biography of Lithuania holds for people everywhere.

Although Lithuania regained her independence after World War I, this historic event did not mark the beginning of an independent Lithuania. Nor did it mark the appearance of a new people on the stage of history. Both of these occurrences had taken place centuries ago, long before the arrival of Christianity in the Baltic States.

During the early Middle Ages, the Lithuanian people had established one of the most powerful and independent states in Europe—a state which was almost as large as France and Germany. Because of their power and their love of independence, the Lithuanian people were the chief defenders of Western civilization against the Mongols and Turks. In their golden age, they encouraged education and toleration and played their part in the general development of European civilization.

But in 1794 the Lithuanian people were overwhelmed by superior numbers and placed in the bonds of czarist slavery. For the next 120 years, they and their children, and their children's children lived under the cruellest oppression and brutality.

Schools, churches, and monasteries were closed. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, including language, schools, the Catholic religion, and the personnel in the nation's administrative offices.

Condemned patriots were shackled, brought to their home communities, and executed publicly with fanfare and display. Priests were beaten and murdered. Parents were forced to witness the execution of their sons. Many thousands were exiled to Siberia.

Yet, in spite of all the oppression and cruelty, there had never been a single generation within those 120 years in which the Lithuanian people did not take up arms in a desperate effort to recover their lost liberty. It was the First World War, however, that again made possible the freedom of Lithuania. With the collapse of czarist Russia and the end of hostilities, the nation of Lithuania was finally able to return to self-government.

A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. It was truly a liberal document. The state of Lithuania was termed an "independent democratic Republic" and sovereign authority was vested in the nation, which exercised it through its Parliament, Government, and courts. The people of the Republic were guaranteed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and religion.

The new state was a progressive one. Its land-reform program was a most effective one. Within a few years after its initia-

tion over 45,000 new farms had been established, and more than 200,000 people were provided with regular occupations and permanent homes.

Along with land reform came the improvement of traditional farming methods.

In education, great progress was also made. Between 1920 and 1937 the number of elementary schools more than doubled and the number of teachers and students increased over threefold.

There was also a great deal of social legislation in the new state. Numerous hospitals were built and community medical centers were set in operation. The 8-hour day became firmly established, and provisions were made for the medical care of the rural population. A sickness insurance system was taking care of 133,000 workmen and their families. It is evident that in the area of progressive and humanitarian legislation, this newly formed Republic was even ahead of us in the United States.

The industry of the nation also thrived during this 20-year period. And the new Republic quickly set to work to improve the neglected railroads and inadequate highways which were left by the czarist henchmen.

The record of the Lithuanian Republic was a highly commendable one. I relate it to you today because it is a record of what a free people can do when they join together in a common effort. I relate it to you today because it is a record of which you and your countrymen can be justly proud.

But just when the fruits of 20 years of hard toil and labor were being realized, war rumblings were heard again in Europe, and the Kremlin leaders broke their promises of peace and friendship and resorted to cynical treachery. Proclamations of Lithuanian neutrality meant little to the Soviet leaders.

Leaders of the young Republic foresaw the real Soviet intentions and were forced into exile. On June 15, 1940, the tiny Baltic nation was crushed by the iron heel of Communist tyranny.

Almost at once, all non-Communist parties and political organizations were abolished. Only the Communist apparatus remained as the legal political party. Elections became a mockery of the democratic process.

On August 25, 1940, a Soviet constitution was shoved down the throats of the Lithuanian people and a long-range program for the sovietization of the Lithuanian political, economic, and social order began.

After the war these efforts increased. A vigorous drive against individual farmers was waged, and complete collectivization of these people became the Soviet's goal. With this regimentation the productivity and living standard of the farmers diminished.

Books were burned, churches were razed, monasteries closed. Hundreds of priests were beaten, tortured, and deported to Siberia. Those people who were brave enough to openly observe their religious holidays were summoned, intimidated, and arrested. The teaching of religion to children was absolutely forbidden.

In 1 week alone in 1941, more than 34,000 persons were deported to remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic.

Between 1948 and 1949, when Lithuanian farmers resisted Soviet collectivization of farmlands, about 10 percent of Lithuania's population was driven to Siberia.

The story of Lithuania is a tragic one. It is a story which tells us much about the nature of our enemy and the will of a courageous people to be free and secure.

The experience of Lithuania is evidence of Communist hypocrisy and their cynical definitions of words like "freedom" and "democracy."

Between 1920 and 1940 the Soviet Union, time and time again, made solemn pronouncements of their policies of noninterference in Lithuanian affairs and of their

desire for peaceful coexistence and friendship.

Those who know the story of Lithuania, of Poland, of Latvia, of Estonia, of Hungary, of East Berlin, of Czechoslovakia, understand the real meaning of Soviet peace movements and overtures.

The story of Lithuania teaches us that the will to be free cannot be extinguished in a courageous people. Neither the United States nor any other free country has recognized the Soviet conquest of the Lithuanian people.

The situation existing in Lithuania today is a blot on the conscience of mankind. It makes a mockery of every Soviet expression of "self-determination" and "national independence."

People of future generations will bear witness to the fact that history is against Communist oppression and dictatorship. Even a hundred and twenty years of most brutal and czarist oppression could not stifle the breath of a freedom-loving people. Despite brutality and conquest, I am sure that the old Lithuanian phrase will, in the end, prevail. "Kas bus, kas nebus, O Lietuva neprazus."

The ancient and wonderful people of Lithuania have been bred to hardship. They have endured pain and suffering from time immemorial. They have seen nations in turmoil. They have felt the stirrings of nations on the move. They have known hardship in warfare against the Crusader, the Tartar, the Russians, and the Germans. They have passed through the crucibles of hate, and have never completely bowed before Slav or German. Their will to be free has never died.

The people of Lithuania have a faith that no amount of brutality and oppression can destroy. The people of Lithuania have a courage that the Soviets can never vanquish. The people of Lithuania have the character and strength to survive all the fraud and the force and the fear of Communist tyranny.

The people of Lithuania have been free in the past. They will be free in the future. And those of us in America will again welcome her to the world of free and peaceful nations.

Your faith in the future can be strengthened by rumblings behind the Iron Curtain. Many in the Soviet Union are living in the hopes that they, too, will one day enjoy the freedom and liberty that all good people hope and pray for.

Time and history are against the rule of tyranny and dictatorship. The desire and determination to be free are universal, even where it seems hopeless today. The spark of human freedom never dies. It burns deeply in the human breast. It will again one day burst into a flame. We trust that the day is not far away when your fatherland and people everywhere will enjoy their God-given rights and move forward to a world of peace, friendship, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include with my remarks the following resolution which was adopted by the society last Sunday:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C.—RESOLUTIONS

Citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area gathered February 11, 1962, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Society, at the Washington Hotel, in the Capital of the United States, for the observance of the 44th anniversary of the restitution of independence of Lithuania, after due deliberation voted the following resolutions to be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the United Nations, Members of Congress of the United States, the diplomatic representatives of the Republics of

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to the press:

"1. We wish to add our voices to other expressions by fellow American citizens of their gratitude to the several succeeding administrations which, ever since July 23, 1940, steadfastly refused to recognize the fruits of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression and continued to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States.

"2. Viewing with gratification the steady progress and peaceful accession by various peoples on the Asian and African continents to sovereign statehood and independence since World War II, achieved in most cases in cooperation with the countries formerly possessed of those areas, we deplore the contrary trend on the European Continent, where the Muscovite Soviet Empire subverted or conquered and reduced to colonial status a number of formerly independent countries with centuries-long traditions of sovereignty and which had played an active part in the development of the Christian European civilization, viz., Lithuania and other countries of central and eastern Europe.

"3. The Washingtonians, Marylanders, and Virginians gathered at this commemorative observance, urgently request the Government of the United States to concern itself more actively, in its quest for peace with liberty and justice, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe—by promoting actively in the United Nations and in meetings with the leaders of the Soviet Union the effects to restore to the peoples of Lithuania and other similarly situated countries their untrammelled sovereignty and to provide the conditions enabling those peoples to choose their own government without the presence of the troops of a foreign dictatorship and of its political arm.

"4. Finally, we extend our greetings and best wishes to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of their cherished independence day."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, once again we direct our thoughts to the brave people of Lithuania, who today observe their Independence Day as best they can behind the Iron Curtain. It is now over 20 years since the Lithuanian people lived in freedom under rulers of their choice, and 44 years to the day since 200 Lithuanian delegates, meeting with the permission of their German rulers, proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles. Shortly after this proclamation German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius and the occupation from the West was succeeded by a new occupation from the East, led by the Red army of the new Soviet Government. Only after driving out this army with the help of Polish forces were the Lithuanian leaders able to realize their proclaimed aim of independence, thus fulfilling the legitimate historical aspirations of the Lithuanian people to be the masters of their own fate. After 1921 the Lithuanians enjoyed a few years of freedom, but the interwar period must have seemed very short indeed for this once mighty nation which had just emerged from 120 years of czarist Russian imperialism.

With the start of the Second World War Lithuania was once again overrun by ruthless invaders, first from Nazi Germany and then from the Soviet Union. The Russians tore up their treaty obligations and incorporated the three tiny Baltic States into the U.S.S.R.

Today the captive nations of Eastern Europe constitute the largest colonial empire in the world, just as the other subjugated peoples of the world are receiving their freedom. But the people of Lithuania have not forgotten their ancient heritage, despite Soviet efforts to cut them off from the world and make them forget that their homeland was ever free. The Communist efforts to make the national minorities in the Soviet Union forget their traditional loyalties has failed in Lithuania, as it has failed in other parts of the Soviet Empire.

Thus we commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day without joyous celebrations, but with a deep sense of responsibility, which I know is shared by every Member of the U.S. Congress. Just as we dare not give the Lithuanian people false hopes regarding their chances for regaining their freedom in the immediate future, so also must we commit ourselves totally to the cause of the free world, which is also the cause of the Lithuanian people, in order that this ruthless Communist dictatorship will eventually give way to an international order which respects the rights of all people to enjoy peace and independence in their homelands. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their independence.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. By doing so we help to keep alive the hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian people who languish under the heel of Soviet Russian imperialism. Lithuania has every right to independence and we must not let the world forget these truths.

The state of Lithuania is actually more than 1,000 years old and its modern-United States reaches back to the beginning of the 13th century. The Lithuanian Lincoln was Grand Duke Mindaugas. In the year 1236 he already led a united Lithuanian Army against the Teutons. In 1251 he adopted Christianity and in 1253 he was crowned King of Lithuania. So the modern Lithuanian state is at least 700 years old. During 120 of these years Lithuania was occupied and ruled by the Russian Empire and many Lithuanians were exterminated and deported to the depths of Russia during this period. The Lithuanians did not, however, surrender to Russia. Succeeding generations rebelled against the occupying force until finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed the severance of all ties with Russia and her restoration as an independent Lithuanian Republic founded on a democratic basis.

For more than two decades Lithuania stood as a bulwark of democracy until, in the name of liberation, it was overrun and forcibly incorporated under the totalitarian tyranny of Soviet communism. But the Lithuanians' love of liberty and democracy could not be extinguished—they burn as brightly as ever.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate again this year the anniversary

of their nation's independence. They will again voice their sympathy for their enslaved countrymen and once more protest vehemently against the alien forces of darkness that have seized their homeland. I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep uppermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, however, this day will not be one of rejoicing in Lithuania for these brave people are under the firm grip of communism. Nevertheless, this anniversary date does offer the people of the free world an opportunity to express their hope that this brave nation, with a history filled with the determination to be free, will once again be able to celebrate its independence day.

During their period of independence—from February 16, 1918, until their occupation by the Nazis in 1941 and later their incorporation with the Soviet Union in 1944—the Lithuanian people showed the world what they could accomplish living in an atmosphere of freedom. This free nation through the creative efforts of her people became a progressive, independent, democratic republic. Rapidly, she became a respected member of the international community.

Communist control of Lithuania, however, marked the end of liberty for the Lithuanian people. Since then, this captive nation has been unable to observe February 16 as a day of celebration. Consequently, this day has become an occasion for the free world in the name of these silenced people to protest the fraudulent incorporation of this helpless nation into the Soviet Union.

In this country, all Americans join with Lithuanian-Americans in expressing this concern for the subjugated Lithuanians by proclaiming that their conscience will never know peace until Lithuania once again will resume her rightful place among the free nations of the world. Furthermore, this day offers us an opportunity to reiterate our promise that we will never accept the bondage of these brave people. In all fairness, we should never encourage false hopes for liberation, but we should assure them that we will continue to work realistically for the truth expressed so appropriately in the Atlantic Charter—that all peoples have the right to choose the form of government under which they desire to live. We are confident that this truth in the end will prevail and that freedom and liberty once more will be restored in Lithuania.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all wars and revolutions cause death and destruction, but some of these bring happiness and joy to some people. The First World War and the Russian revolution of 1917 ushered in a new era to many oppressed nationalities in the defunct

Russian Empire. Many of these asserted their freedom after the overthrow of the czarist regime in 1917, and proclaimed their independence. Thus the Lithuanian independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, was a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had become part of czarist Russia and for more than 100 years Lithuanians had to endure the oppressive yoke of Russia's autocratic regime. The czar's callous and cruel officials during that long period did all in their power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. Yet against all oppressions the Lithuanians retained their sense of nationality. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their ideals, and longed for their national independence.

On February 16, 44 years ago, Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed their political independence. In the employment of that freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly, and in the course of two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged country as a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. Then came the Second World War, which in the course of its first year swallowed independent Lithuania and made it, much against the wishes of the helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for the 2-year period during the war, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been oppressed by the tyrannical government imposed upon them by the Communist rulers of the Kremlin. This they suffer in misery and under conditions approaching servitude beneath the heel of their detested and despised overlords. At the same time, in their hearts they all cherish the hope that someday, somehow, freedom and independence may dawn over their heads in their historic and beloved homeland. On the 44th anniversary of their independence day I am glad to join all freedom-loving Lithuanians and echo their genuine patriotic feelings for a free Lithuania.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut, February 16 has been officially designated as Lithuanian Day to commemorate the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. Whereas all of America will be marking this day, Connecticut will be taking special note to honor the many citizens of Lithuanian descent who reside in Connecticut. While honoring the Lithuanian people on this day, we also join them in their sorrow and in their hope for their native land.

The tragic history of Lithuania's abortive attempt at independence has been recorded in the hearts of freemen as a lesson in the cruelty of Soviet subjugation and also in the faith and tenacity of a nation striving to retain her national identity. Lithuania's fate has typified all too realistically the conflict between freedom and totalitarian communism, between the very elements of good and evil. Lithuania had the courage and the spirit to resist tyranny, but because it lacked the force of arms, Bolshevik Russia reconquered the young nation.

To their everlasting honor, the idea of freedom has never been erased from the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. Although the conquering Bolshevik hordes executed or deported her intellectual leaders and crushed with unlimited terror the valiant resistance movement, the Lithuanian people have heroically clung to their cultural and spiritual heritage. Thus, in its oppression and frustration, Lithuania has become a living symbol of the love and sacrifice of freedom.

We who are free from the restrictions of the Iron Curtain can openly honor and commemorate Lithuania on this day and reaffirm our support of Lithuania's fight for freedom.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people emerged from several centuries of domination by their Russian neighbors, as well as from several years of occupation by the German forces of World War I. Liberty was won at last, but difficult to retain.

Lithuanian freedom lasted only the length of the interwar period. A few days after the German attack on the Soviet Union, in 1941, Lithuania was overrun by Nazi troops. Later when the tide of war turned against the Germans, Lithuania came under the equally ruthless domination of the Soviet Union. Since that time Lithuania has remained a Russian captive, virtually isolated from the West.

But Lithuania's brief taste of freedom has been enough to keep the will to be independent alive. Today, in observing this day of independence that is the symbol of Lithuanian aspirations, we reflect upon the tragic history of that brave land. We cannot allow the desire for freedom, the hope for independence, to go un nourished. The future does not belong to the Soviet Communists any more than it did to Hitler's "master race." The United States has not and will not forget the plight of the Lithuanian people. Today we rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom everywhere, in the name of Lithuania, and in the name of justice for all men.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania and the attainment of a long cherished dream of freedom from foreign domination. On that date in 1918, before the end of World War I, a few million people courageously overcame generations of despotic rule and, at the same time, inspired the hearts of freedom-loving people all over the world.

Our celebration of the freedom won by the Lithuanian people is clouded, however, by the knowledge that these people are again in captivity. In the tragic events which preceded our entry into World War II, two decades of independence ended abruptly with the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1939. Along with the other Baltic Republics, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was drawn by the force of the Red army into subjugation by the Soviet Union.

There was the pretense of free elections during the occupation, but the

very presence of Soviet force made it dramatically clear that those elections were only a mockery. The need for such force, furthermore, demonstrated that the Kremlin had not completely defeated the desire for liberty by the valiant Lithuanian people.

Today, Americans of Lithuanian descent are continuing to keep alive the many aspects of Lithuanian tradition and culture which have enriched our country. They also nourish the hope that national independence may be restored and under a regime which truly seeks social and political justice.

All Americans, I know, share with me the earnest hope that Lithuanians will again enjoy the God-given rights of freedom and liberty. I join the other Members of this House to express sympathy and friendship to a brave people. We pray that for them the future will bring independence to their homeland and the right to pursue in peace their own national destiny.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and later during the same year in 1918 Lithuania became a republic.

The anniversary of this day which we now celebrate brings to our mind very vividly the birth of independence and freedom in our own country many years before.

We realize full well the long road that was traveled by the Lithuanian people prior to the time they could shake off the yoke of bondage and call themselves free. This freedom was not theirs for long, however, for in 1940 Lithuania was seized by the Russians and immediately the cloak of censorship was dropped over that little country and today it is engulfed with the other satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Just as the spirit of freedom lived on in the minds of the early American settlers during the days of the Revolution, so also does that spirit of freedom still grow in the hearts of the Lithuanian people in their own country.

Today we honor these people and it is our fervent prayer and fond hope that one day they too will regain that precious gift and to that end we join them in our hopes and our prayers.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in expressing tribute to the people of Lithuania on this 44th anniversary of their independence. February 16, 1918, marked the end of well over a century during which Lithuania suffered under a hostile, foreign rule. There was confidence and rejoicing that day as independence became theirs at last. Lithuania's social and economic record between the World Wars was a good one and she assumed the obligations of a modern progressive state.

Her hopes for continued freedom, however, were soon crushed between the pincer drive of Germany and Soviet Russia into the Baltic area. After a preliminary period of conquest by the Russians, occupation by the Germans, and then reconquest by the Russians, Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union in 1944. Since that time Lithuania has been held

within the Russian orbit as a Soviet republic. The U.S. Government, however, has consistently refused to acknowledge this imperialistic conquest and still recognizes Lithuania as a free and independent nation.

One could not blame the Lithuanian people if they were to assume a defeatist attitude after such tribulations. And yet the spirit of independence still fires the hearts of these courageous men and women. They live for and dream of the day on which the flag of free Lithuania may once again wave over their land. Let us salute them today and pledge our continued efforts to support their unending fight for freedom.

Mr. FRIDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is rightly said that the whole world is kin. That is why we, as liberty-loving Americans, take cognizance that tomorrow, February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. We feel a kinship with our fellow human beings on the other side of the ocean which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts. We understand and appreciate the longing for freedom and independence that the brave people of Lithuania have.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania regained her freedom which, unfortunately, was short lived. In 1940, during the course of the last war, Lithuania's independence was lost and that unhappy country fell under the ruthless heel of Communist tyrants who were bent on destroying the rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, the spirit of liberty and the dedication to self-determination still lives strongly in the bosom of every person in that now unhappy land.

Here we can see a striking example that the world cannot take the word of the Russians nor believe anything they might say or agree to. By the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and forever renounced all rights possessed by it over the Lithuanian people and its territory. Notwithstanding such guaranteed liberty and a solemn treaty and agreement of nonaggression, Russia regarded such formal covenant as a mere scrap of paper and violated it with wanton disregard.

The mere fact that we, here in the Congress of the United States, take time out from our pressing legislative duties to not only take note of Lithuania's plight, but to recognize Russia's failure to live up to their treaty obligations, should give new hope to the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot, we will not, abandon these people who have been so sorely oppressed by the evil and dark forces of communism. I maintain that it is our duty as human beings to encourage enslaved peoples everywhere in their hopes for freedom and the achievement of dignity to which man is fully entitled.

It so happens that during the month of February, the United States joyously celebrates the birthdays of two truly great men, Washington and Lincoln, fighters for human freedom, liberty and justice. We Americans are, indeed, blessed to possess such precious rights

and feel that people in other lands are also entitled to them. That is why I am in favor of House Resolution 211, a measure calling for the establishment, in the House of Representatives, of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

To our fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent who have contributed so very much to enrich our own culture and economy, we must show that we will continue to support the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere and strive for the restoration of true independence for Lithuania. This we must do until their liberation is an established fact.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of special significance, and I hold it a great honor to join in this commemoration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania's history as a nation dates back to the year 1200. She possesses an inheritance of rich cultural values and a splendid record of individual people who have a deep sense of compassion for their fellow men.

Lithuania's long struggle toward freedom has been marked with blood and tears. The forcible seizure of this freedom-loving country by the Soviet Union, and the occupation by the Soviet of Lithuania's two neighboring states, Latvia and Estonia, is an indelible stain on the history of civilization. This illegal action has never been recognized by the United States, and we are committed to the restoration of freedom in these brave nations.

Untold sufferings, privations, and blood have been paid by liberty-loving Lithuanians to gain their freedom. To retain this glowing spirit of liberty, to strengthen and to expand it, requires constant vigilance and perseverance, and that is our task.

On this occasion, we rededicate ourselves to principle and to the long hard struggle of regaining freedom for Lithuania. May the courage and loyalty of Lithuanians the world over draw the admiration and praise of all liberty-loving people of every nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday the 16th of February, the men and women of Lithuania and Lithuanian descent will be celebrating the 44th anniversary of that nation's independence. Only in Lithuania itself, where the iron rule of a Communist Russian dictatorship holds sway, is this day not celebrated.

Today we pay homage to a proud but enslaved nation, and in so doing, we serve warning to all oppressors that freedom everywhere look with disdain and repugnance on the deeds of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years, in the 19th century, patriotic Lithuanians worked for their day of freedom from czarist oppression. At last their cherished dream came true in 1918. For more than 20 years Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence. They organized a democratic form of government, enacted many progressive social and economic institutions, and became a respected member in the family of nations. But, unfortunately, in the fall of 1939 it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet

Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. First came the Nazi occupation, and then in 1944 the dreaded Red army returned, and has remained ever since. Lithuania has been cut off from the outside world and the country is again under foreign domination.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania in the hope that we may soon see a new day in which Lithuania may again enjoy freedom as a nation and contribute to the progress of a free world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once more it is with a feeling of privilege and honor that I join my colleagues here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in tribute to Lithuania. Tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of that proud country. After a prolonged period of Russian domination followed by German occupation during World War I, the Lithuanian people finally reached the goal for which they had been striving on February 16, 1918. As history records, that freedom was short lived and Lithuania was once again dominated when occupied by Russia in World War II. In July of 1940 she was forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union.

The dedication of the people of Lithuania to regain their independence as a nation and to reestablish personal freedom throughout their land remains steadfast—this despite the cruel yoke of Russian suppression which has held Lithuania in virtual slavery.

Today all patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanians in the free world celebrate their national independence. Unfortunately their brothers in the homeland are not permitted to do so by their Communist overlords. That sacred privilege is denied them. Let us all hope and pray that soon they will once again become masters of their own destiny, and that they will be able to celebrate this great day in freedom and honor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has been known to history since the year 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. As a result of repeated threats from abroad these principalities joined together in a united state, and in 1253 a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, as the king of a united Lithuania. By the 14th century the Lithuanian state had extended its boundaries into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Lithuanian influence was further extended by a union with Poland, first in the 14th century as a result of a marriage between the rulers of the two countries, then as a legal union which lasted from the 16th century until almost the end of the 18th. During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians established a powerful and independent European state, which successfully turned back various foreign invasions. The eastern Slavs enjoyed far more freedom than the residents of Moscow and

were able to live in peace with neighboring countries.

It may help us to understand the present unfortunate condition of the Lithuanian nation if we recall that Russian domination goes back to 1795, when Poland was divided for the third time. The Lithuanians repeatedly tried to throw out the Russians, but without success. The Russians reacted to the revolts by trying to replace Lithuanian culture and language with Russian, but the Lithuanians remained loyal to their traditional religion, language and culture, and the Soviet attempts at Russification were finally abandoned in 1905.

Lithuania was overrun by invading armies in the First and Second World Wars, and on both occasions she was at the mercy of both German and Russian conquerors. However, the Russian revolution and the defeat of Germany provided Lithuanian nationalists with a long-awaited opportunity to make good their suppressed desires for freedom. In 1917, 200 Lithuanians received permission from the German Government to hold a congress on the future of Lithuania, and on February 16, 1918—44 years ago today—this meeting proposed an independent Lithuanian state based on the principles of freedom and democracy.

But the evacuating German troops were replaced by members of the Red Army, who promptly installed a Communist government. Only after the Soviet forces were driven out by the Polish Army, led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and with the help of Lithuanian soldiers, did Russia sign a peace treaty. This document, signed in 1920, proclaimed Russia's recognition of Lithuania as an independent nation and a Soviet pledge that "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How ironic do these words sound 40 years later, and how little weight do legal documents carry when pitted against the overwhelming force of a large nation.

The peace settlement with Russia was followed by a dispute between Lithuania and Poland over their common boundary and the city of Vilnius, which the Lithuanians wanted as their capital. This controversy was resolved by the League of Nations in 1923. The Lithuanians lost Vilnius but gained the formerly German territory of Memel. Lithuania was herself admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and like so many other smaller powers served as a constructive force for peace. Meanwhile the Lithuanians elected their first president and adopted a constitution, guaranteeing the basic civil liberties and freedom to all its citizens.

The Soviet Union's sympathy for Lithuania, expressed in the decisive language of the 1920 peace treaty, is explained by the geographical position of the small Baltic State, with her common frontiers with both Poland and Germany, which made Lithuania a convenient pawn in the diplomatic and military

game. During the interwar years the Soviet Government consistently supported the Lithuanian claim for the return of her historic capital of Vilnius from Poland, even though the Lithuanian Government of this period were strongly anti-Communist. But Soviet friendship was, of course, deceptive. When Russia and Germany divided Poland between them in 1939, the Soviet Union returned the city of Vilnius to Lithuania, but the gift did not cost the Russians anything, for shortly thereafter they annexed all of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. The tiny country of Lithuania was overrun by successive waves of Soviet, German, and in 1944, once again, Soviet armies.

After their incorporation into the Soviet Union the three Baltic States were kept sealed off from the outside world. Until 1959, when Vilnius was opened, no Western observers were allowed into Lithuania. The rest of the country remains closed today, perhaps because the Baltic coast is ideally suited for missile bases.

Mr. Speaker, I have recalled the unhappy modern history of the Lithuanian people in some detail because I believe it important that we appreciate the background of Lithuanian suffering. The Kremlin can deny the freedom to work, talk or travel, but the Lithuanian people still remain the masters of their souls, and the passionate desire for freedom remains. This desire is a common heritage of the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States; it forms a bond no Iron Curtain can break.

And therefore, the privilege we have today of celebrating the Lithuanian independence, like all privileges, carries with it a responsibility. We here today, and the entire free world, have the heavy responsibility and the awesome challenge to be sure that someday Lithuania again will be free. We have this responsibility not only because Lithuania deserves her freedom, but also because the free world would not long remain free if it forgets those who are less fortunate.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the American people take the opportunity to tell the people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and their hopes are also our hopes. This is an opportunity too to give notice to the Soviet jailers that we have not forgotten the brave people of Lithuania they hold as prisoners. And so today is primarily a day to rededicate ourselves to the age-old struggle for freedom that has characterized the history of both the United States and Lithuania, a struggle for the dignity of man, a struggle to free him from oppression of all kinds, a struggle full of hope for the coming day of deliverance. I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, with the entire American people and with the whole free world in a salute to the people of Lithuania.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is an impressive fact that Lithuanian Independence Day is being celebrated here in America. Here we cherish freedom. We honor those who defy domination. We welcome the heritage from a rich past, the contribution of a determined

present, and the inspiration of a faith in the future. The Lithuanian people brought to America their love of liberty, their courage in the face of vicissitude, their tradition of centuries of civilization, their industry, and their hopefulness.

Though the Lithuania whose 44th anniversary we celebrate on February 16 is currently dominated by the Russians, it has a confidence in its regeneration which is supported by the very vicissitudes of its centuries-old past. For Lithuania, with a history and a civilization older than that of most of Europe, has been repeatedly overrun by hordes from east, west, and south. Repeatedly, it has emerged, retaining its traditions, its individuality, and its hope. The Lithuanian people have remained free in spirit, stalwart in their resistance.

There have been long periods in Lithuanian history of great progress and renown. Politically, socially, economically, and culturally the contributions of Lithuania to the development of western civilization have been great.

We in America have benefited greatly from the Lithuanians in our midst. The Lithuanian-Americans have perpetuated here their culture as old as the Christian era. A religious people, they have maintained their piety and their ideals. The suffering of generations under violence from without, domination, and disaster has but refined their endurance and their determination to retain their native characteristics. They have lived in closely knit groups, pursuing their particular arts, crafts, religion, and social habits; but with great concern for one another. Philanthropy has marked their contributions to society.

They have given, too, of their talents to the outside world. Lithuanian farmers, journalists, tailors, musicians, and artists have made names for themselves in the history of American development. The progress of the United States has depended upon the blending of such ethnic groups as these, maintaining withal their individuality, their hardihood, and the pursuit of their ideals.

Those who are aware of the richness of their past, the tenacity, the courage, and the vigor of her people today will have no doubt as to the future of an indomitable, indestructible Lithuania.

Mrs. KELLY. On February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian nation.

The history of Lithuania has not been a happy one. For a century and a quarter czarist Russia ruled the small Baltic state and even attempted to replace the Lithuanian language, culture, and traditions with its own. This forced Russification was, however, unsuccessful, and with the collapse of the czarist regime the Lithuanian people reasserted their desire for independence and, in 1918, proclaimed the Republic of Lithuania.

The next two decades saw the new nation grow and progress. It was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and thus became a member of the community of nations. Its infant industry expanded, and a successful land-reform program was put into effect. Lithuanian literature flourished, and significant

achievements were made in opera and music. On August 3, 1940, however, this progress came to a halt. The Soviet Union forced the formation of a friendly government, occupied the country, and finally declared Lithuania a constituent republic in the U.S.S.R. After this occupation the country was overrun by Nazi forces and then once again, near the end of World War II, by the Red army.

Despite the heavy yoke of communism which they bear, the Lithuanians have never lost their hope for freedom and independence. They have caught what Thomas Jefferson once called "the disease of liberty" and refused to relinquish their inalienable right to self-determination. We Americans, as leaders of the free world, have an obligation to keep that hope alive not only in Lithuania but in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is for this reason that I have established within the House Foreign Affairs Committee a Subcommittee on Captive Nations. In its hearings on captive nations, the subcommittee will have the following objectives in mind:

First. To focus attention on the people of the captive European nations.

Second. To study present conditions within the captive European nations, including the possibility of changes from their present status, to study present policies of the United States regarding them, and to provide the Congress with the latest and most reliable information on the situation in the captive European nations.

Third. To expose to the rest of the world that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly welded these captive nations into the Soviet colonial empire and is despotically keeping their peoples oppressed, while at the same time falsely and hypocritically posing as the international champion of those seeking liberty and independence.

On this anniversary I can only pledge my continued support for the Lithuanian people and hope that they will soon see the realization of their dream of a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, since 1918, the Lithuanian people, having tasted of the precious fruit of freedom, have never relinquished their hope that one day it will be theirs again. It was in 1918, after centuries of subjugation to czarism, that the people established their own government and chose the pattern of independence, but the securing and maintaining of liberty is a never-ending battle as the Lithuanians have learned again and again. They fought off the Bolsheviks in 1920 only to find that 22 years later they were once again subjected to Soviet rule.

Thus the celebration of Independence Day by a people no longer free is not a contradiction in terms but a massive symbol that the spirit of liberty is alive. This celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is not only a reminder to all of us how many peoples still live in subjugation but it is also a reminder, as history proves again and again, that tyranny carries within it the seeds of its own destruction.

The friends of freedom hail Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with my fellow Representatives here today in paying tribute to the great people of Lithuania and our own Lithuanian-Americans who are celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1962, our observance here is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Kremlin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

We must dedicate ourselves today to the continuing revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the free world shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this restoration will soon be accomplished.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people constitute one of the smaller ethnic groups in northeastern Europe, but in the past they have played an exceptionally important part. The state they founded some 700 years ago endured for centuries, and at one time was a real force in all east European affairs. Then late in the 18th century Lithuania became part of the Russian empire, and for more than a hundred years Lithuanians lived under czarist autocracy. During the First World War when the czarist regime was no more, they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

Having thus attained their national goal they worked hard in making Lithuania a model democracy, and there they lived happily for two decades. Then came World War II and with it Lithuania's tragedy. In 1940 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union and independent Lithuania vanished in thin air. For a couple of years during the war it was occupied by the Nazi forces. Then in 1944 Russia returned and reoccupied the country once more, making it again part of the Soviet Union. Since

then unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom and have been suffering under oppressive regimes instituted and maintained there by the Kremlin. But the people of Lithuania have not surrendered their right to freedom and independence, and today in their Independence Day we hope that they attain their goal once more and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state. This proclamation signaled the end of more than a century of foreign domination and the beginning of a new era for the Lithuanian people. On July 12, 1920, Lithuania's right to freedom was recognized by Russia when that country pledged to renounce all rights of sovereignty over Lithuanian territory. It was recognized as a sovereign and stable member of the world community when, on September 22, 1921, it was admitted to the League of Nations.

The next two decades were marked by the fulfillment of many of the hopes which had sustained Lithuanian nationalism through the long period of czarist rule. A constitution was adopted which accorded freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and communication. A land reform program enlarged the number of farms, and new industries were established. Lithuanian culture, unfettered at last, flourished with new accomplishments in literature and music.

Unfortunately, the location of Lithuania, with Germany to the west and the Soviet Union to the east, rendered it almost impossible for it to survive the aggressions of the Second World War. Although Lithuania attempted to maintain its neutrality, it was occupied first by the Soviets, then by the Germans, then again by the Soviets. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

The freedom which the Lithuanian people enjoyed between the two World Wars stands in sharp contrast to the subjugation which Lithuania has experienced in the past two decades. In place of freedom of speech and communication and other civil liberties are rigid controls and restrictions. In place of mutually beneficial contacts with the West there is the Iron Curtain which keeps at a minimum the number of meetings between Lithuanians and outsiders.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is my hope that these statements in the U.S. Congress will demonstrate to the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten. If freedom-loving people throughout the world continue to have faith in their beliefs and to work unceasingly to strengthen liberty, we can be confident that ultimately freedom and democracy must be victorious over totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today free people throughout the non-Communist world take a few moments from their daily activities to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people. Forty-four years ago today, the freedom-loving Lithuanians reestablished their independence and proclaimed the formation of a

Lithuanian Republic founded on the principles of liberty and freedom.

Lithuania was united in 1253 when the many principalities of Lithuania were formed into a single state. Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, was crowned as king by a personal delegate of Pope Innocent IV. This was one of the first expressions of the Christian faith of the Lithuanian people, and Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state in 1387.

It was this same Christian faith that contributed strongly to saving Europe from barbarism in the late 14th century, when the Lithuanians successfully repulsed the Tartar hordes seeking to sweep in upon Europe. During the Middle Ages they also defended their independence against the Germans and the Russians. At that time they were one of the greatest states of eastern Europe, as Lithuania's boundaries in the 14th century reached into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Through marriage ties and parliamentary action Lithuania and Poland were joined legally in the 16th century. In 1795, by the third partition of Poland, Lithuania was annexed by czarist Russia. The Lithuanians struggled in vain to throw off the Russian yoke. The Russians responded by attempting to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture, but they too were unsuccessful, as the Lithuanians tenaciously clung to their historical religion, language, and cultural traditions. Finally the Russification policy was abandoned in 1905.

During the First and Second World Wars Lithuania was overrun by both the Germans and the Russians. In these two terrible wars, the innocent Lithuanians, due to an unfortunate accident of geography, stood on the lines and march between the two giants of Europe, and as the military advantage changed from one side to the other, the country became a tragic battlefield, ravaged by gigantic armies.

During the ebb and flow of World War I the Lithuanians capitalized on the conditions favorable for asserting their independence. In 1917 delegates representing the people of Lithuania met to determine the future course of the Nation. Out of this Congress came the announcement of the formation of the Lithuanian state, on February 16, 1918. It is the 44th anniversary of this proclamation that we honor today.

But Lithuanian independence had not yet become a reality, as the Red army invaded the capital and set up a Communist puppet regime in January of 1919. During the following year Lithuanian and Polish fighting forces under Marshal Pilsudski drove out the oppressive Bolsheviks.

In the peace treaty signed with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, Russia pledged to recognize Lithuania as an independent nation and to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The language of the agreement reads in part: "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recogni-

tion, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How false and cynical those words seem today, over 40 years later. Today it has become such a commonplace to speak of Communist duplicity that sometimes we tend to disregard the tragic consequences of that duplicity. The pillaging of a proud and freedom-loving nation is not a matter to be lightly passed over, and I would maintain that if ever we should become apathetic to such outrages, the moral fiber of our country will have been gravely weakened.

When the Russians forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in October 1939 they were acting in direct violation of the peace treaty of 1920 and the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of non-aggression of 1926. Under the terms of this so-called mutual assistance treaty, Lithuanian sovereignty was drastically compromised as the Russians demanded the right to have airbases and Soviet garrisons on the soil of Lithuania. In June 1940 the Russians compounded their tyranny by demanding the formation of a friendly government. Then they ruthlessly occupied the country, and by August 1940 Lithuania had been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. After the Nazi attack on Russia, Lithuania became a German colony for 3 years, until it was recaptured by the Soviets in 1944.

From World War II until 1959 all of Lithuania was closed to Western observers. Since 1959 some Americans have been allowed to enter the city of Vilnius, but the rest of the country remains sealed off. From scattered reports we can put together a pretty clear picture of what has been happening inside Lithuania during the years it has suffered under Communist domination. The picture is not a pretty one. It tells of brutal murders, of deportations, and of slave labor camps. It testifies to a vicious campaign to scatter the Lithuanian people and replace them in their homeland by Russians. And it exposes a brutal plot to destroy the religious faith and love of liberty of the Lithuanian nation. But from this somber story emerges a message and an inspiration for freemen everywhere. The Lithuanian people love God and they love their country deeply. And no Soviet atheist totalitarianism can destroy this precious heritage. The Lithuanian passion for freedom will never die, and communism will not be able to hold in bondage a proud people yearning and determined that one day they shall again be free.

The United States has on many occasions reaffirmed its support of Lithuanian independence. We recognized the independent Lithuanian Government in 1922 and have never accepted Soviet domination of the country. Emphasizing our moral commitment to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with a representative of the former independent Government, which still has a legation in Washington.

Lithuanians who have come to settle in the United States have made many unique contributions to American civ-

ilization. The first known Lithuanian immigrants landed at New Amsterdam in 1688. Today there are an estimated one million Americans of Lithuanian descent. These Lithuanians have been widely praised for their patriotic devotion, their religious piety, their close family ties, and their community spirit.

Today I take great pride in joining with loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in celebrating this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people brought to an end the ruthless rule of czarist Russia, which had lasted 120 years. During the Middle Ages Lithuania had been a powerful and independent state, whose borders extended into the heart of what is now the Soviet Union. The legitimate national aspirations of the Lithuanian people were crushed in 1795, when their country was annexed to Russia as part of the third partition of Poland. Yet the steadfast Lithuanians repeatedly revolted against their Russian overlords and remained loyal to their ancient language, culture, and traditions despite continuous Russian efforts to make them forget their independence.

In 1919 and 1920 the Lithuanians established their independence by force of arms, and during the next two decades they made significant contributions to the cause of world peace, both through the efforts of their spokesmen at the League of Nations and by living peacefully with their Polish and Soviet neighbors. The history of this tiny independent state between 1920 and 1939 effectively destroys the Soviet claim that their domination of the captive nations of Eastern Europe is necessary to insure the security of the Soviet Union. Yet the period of independence was not destined to last. Despite the Soviet renunciation in 1920 of "all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," Lithuania was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in 1940. It was one of the first countries to suffer under the brutal occupations of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. After the war the Soviets ordered large-scale deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia and many Russians have settled in Lithuania. For a long time the country was completely closed off to foreigners, who are now permitted to visit the capital city of Vilnius. Stalin's attempt to disperse the Baltic peoples has since been abandoned, and in the small towns and farms of rural Lithuania the ancient tradition of national independence has not been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is no longer a free and independent nation, but the spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts of this sturdy people. As happens so often in the history of Europe, a small nation is in bondage because the military force of a larger neighbor proved more powerful than its legal commitments. We Americans may take some pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania into the Communist empire, has never given its sanction to this lawless act of brute force perpetrated on a

small and defenseless nation. We salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their national independence with a sense of deep responsibility and commitment to the ideals of liberty which they share with the entire free world.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation. In doing so we pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania who cannot themselves publicly celebrate this important event which marked a milestone in their struggle for freedom.

Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after centuries of subjugation, sometimes German, but mostly Russian. Never during those years of struggle did the Lithuanian people lose sight of their ultimate goal of self-determination. In 1940 Lithuania lost its independence once again when the Soviet Union annexed it and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, and made them republics of the U.S.S.R. This act was in such callous disregard of the sovereign and human rights of the Lithuanian people and in complete violation of international law that it has never been recognized by the United States. Yet despite their many trials the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged. The passion for liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist Soviet attempts to inculcate communism and the Soviet way of life, remain strong.

On this day the American people who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession, join their hopes and aspirations with their fellow men in Lithuania. We renew our devotion to the cause of Lithuanian independence. We hope that the day may not be prolonged when Lithuania will once again regain her rightful position in the family of free nations which she so richly deserves.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the nation of Lithuania has been known to history for almost a thousand years. During that time the Lithuanian people have experienced the joys of greatness and independence as well as the tragedies of war and subjugation. Today Lithuania is in one of its darkest periods. On this Lithuanian Independence Day it is fitting that we who are fortunate enough to live in the free world pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian people and express our hope that the light of liberty will someday shine in their land again.

The first great period of Lithuanian independence was in the Middle Ages. During this period the Lithuanians established a powerful state which was able to check the German drive to the east and protect Europe from the Mongols and the Tartars. They gave their people a degree of freedom which was far higher than in neighboring countries, and through their education and toleration played a significant role in the development of European civilization.

In 1795, however, this bright period of Lithuanian history came to an end

and Lithuania was annexed by Russia. The Lithuanians undertook many revolts against czarist oppression, but they met with no success. Following these revolts the Russians launched attempts to wipe out the Lithuanian language and culture and replace them with Russian ways, but such attempts proved impossible and eventually had to be abandoned.

This long dark period of Russian domination was brought to an end by the First World War. Although the Lithuanians paid a terrible price in that war, in terms of lives and devastation, they emerged as an independent state once again. It was this period of independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, that we commemorate today. The Lithuanians thrived in their work of improving the economic and social conditions of their people and building an independent state, and the next two decades marked one of the happiest periods in Lithuanian history.

But just as the First World War had brought freedom to the Lithuanian people, the Second World War deprived them of their liberty. Although Lithuania tried to remain neutral, it was occupied by the Red army and in 1940 was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Later, in 1941, it was overrun by German forces. Still another reversal took place in 1944 when Lithuania was retaken by the Soviets, and today Lithuania remains under the Soviet domination imposed at that time.

Thus it is that today Lithuania finds itself again in a period of darkness, with an iron curtain draped around its borders to keep out rays of light from the free world. However, it is impossible to prevent all contact with the outside. I feel sure that the statements being made here today, showing that the Lithuanian people and their love of freedom have not been forgotten, will find their way to those who cling to their ideals. It is my hope that in some small way our words will add to their faith that the free world will eventually triumph in the cold war and the Lithuanians and all other peoples denied their political and human rights will be able to hold high the torch of liberty once again.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, only the marked sadness of this, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a free nation, mars the conscience of the free people of the world.

The sufferings of its people in the bloody grip of Soviet rule, first under the czarist oppression for 123 years and now under Soviet tyranny and slavery since 1940, have not destroyed the will of its people to be free. This brave race, cultured in the glorious traditions of its heroic leaders dating before the Christian era, facing the many sufferings of her people with tolerance and with prayers to the Almighty, courageously awaits the day of her liberation from Soviet domination.

The 7 mass deportations of her citizens and many lesser ones—2,000 to 3,000 a month—totaling 600,000 souls, has failed to quench this brave nation's thirst for the freedom of those enslaved within and without her borders. One-

fourth of her sons have been transported to the interior of Russia, as slaves. Thousands have died in prison camps and in exile. Thus, through mass fear, the inevitable weakening of her patriotic national will lies diluted with despair, questioning if freedom will ever be realized.

The great problem confronting the United States is, Can we really maintain our own institutions of freedom for long—as we view the encroachments made by the Communists upon the free nations of the world—each falling within its aura of godless enslavement?

The United States has already moved with celerity to curb the menace at our own doorstep. This administration, in 1 year, has put the seal of the Monroe Doctrine on the North and South American Continents. Our neighboring nations are alerted to the communistic practices that lead to domination.

We must do more—we must use every force to release the small nations throughout Europe and the Baltic areas. The West must force its preparedness programs to the extreme of our national abilities to pay, in order to give confidence to the new nations of the East and Africa, that no one dare controvert our desires to keep the world of freemen free.

The nations enslaved must be freed, that Christianity prevail. The bodies of men may be enslaved, but the "self," "the spirit," "the soul," can never be lost to tyranny. Lithuania must be saved. Her independence must be restored. The dignity of man must be preserved with free institutions to protect it. America is the one hope that keeps alive the fires of freedom among all men—let us not let them down. We are prepared to march in freedom's name—with God's guidance, we will prevail.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has had a stormy history. For 22 years, following the war of 1914-18, it was an independent state. In the era of its greatest power it stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. After it was converted to Christianity in 1385, it was dominated by Polish influence for more than 400 years. It was annexed by imperial Russia in 1795 but at the time of the Communist revolution it broke away from the Soviet Union and proclaimed its independence.

But the lights of freedom were soon put out by the sharp winds of World War II. In June 1940 Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops, and soon after was blackmailed into becoming the 14th Soviet republic. Thousands of Lithuanians were deported to the east as the Soviet war lords sought to communize the country. The United States refused to recognize the Communist conquest.

The whiptides of war loosed the Soviet hold on Lithuania and the German Nazis occupied the country from 1941 to 1944. But with the German defeat Lithuania was again annexed to the Soviet Union. It remains a captive nation, tied to its eastern overlords in unhappy bondage.

Lithuania looks to the West, not to the East. It has a Christian heritage. Like all people, the Lithuanian people

would like to be free to decide their own destiny. And some day they will be.

For if there is one thing that we can be sure of, it is that the wave of the future is on the side of human liberty, and that the various totalitarianisms, whether they be Communist or Fascist, will eventually die away. This is the hope which those of Lithuanian descent in this country can always hold out to their kinsmen behind the Curtain.

#### SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since I have been a Member of this historic body annually on the 15th of February or the date nearest thereto, when the House is in session, to observe the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* with some remarks in memory of the 266 Americans who perished with the *Maine* in Havana Harbor, and the war with Spain that followed.

Today I have an especially warm sense of audience receptability in talking of the Spanish-American War. The eminent and beloved gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, a great American in every sense and by every measure of accomplishment and human qualities, is from Massachusetts, and in the Spanish-American War, the outfit to which I belonged—the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan—was brigaded with the great 9th of Massachusetts, and during the years JOHN McCORMACK has been the unfailing friend of the Spanish War veterans. I feel I am speaking in a sympathetic atmosphere with this great gentleman in the chair, one who has always been understanding of the spirit of 1898 and of the volunteers who went to Cuba and who saw action in the siege of Santiago.

Mr. Speaker, 92 veterans of that war of 64 years ago, a war that started our country on the road to a world destiny have served in this body. When I came here in the 81st Congress, I was one of four Spanish-American War veterans who were Members of that Congress and with two of the other three I had soldiered in Cuba in the same regiment, the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

I am the last remaining, the last veteran of that war in the Congress. My colleagues have been sympathetically understanding of the sense of solemn obligation that possesses me to set the record straight so far as it is within my humble power to do so in the brief time remaining, of the history of a war that was preceded by the Civil War and followed by two World Wars, conflicts that engaged vastly larger numbers and extended over much longer periods of time which despite its tremendous impact on the history of the world and the brilliance of its action on both sea and land because of the overshadowing events that followed has become the forgotten little war, as one latter-day historian not too aptly described it.

I think that future historians when the passage of time has furnished a truer scale of measurements more accurately will say that the rise of the United States to world power was preceded by a 50-year war commencing with the war with Spain, then an interlude of peace when military muscles were being flexed, then World War I, and then another interlude of peace, and finally World War II.

I look back 64 years, and it does not seem very long. Yet when in 1898 events that had happened in 1834, as I read of them in history, seemed so far, far away. What changes had come to our Republic in the 64 years between 1834 and 1898. What changes have come in the 64 years between 1898, when the United States was rising to meet the challenge of her destiny, and 1962—all in just a part of the span of my life.

The seats of this historic Chamber are filled with the veterans of World War I and World War II, many with years of the test of combat. The story of their deeds, if it could be compressed in a volume, would be a classic epic of heroism.

But one by one, two by two, they will depart in the march of the years until one day in the Congress, where had served with distinction and dedication so many hundred veterans of the World Wars, but one will remain. I wish for him the warmth in his association with his younger colleagues that you have given to me. From the bottom of my heart wells a sentiment of gratitude.

When the Honorable James Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, was in the other body, he was a member of Columbia Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, a camp to which I have belonged for many years and twice have served as camp commander, once in 1915 when I was Lieutenant Governor and again some years later. There were close to a thousand members of Columbia Camp at that time. Now few remain. The column of the names of past commanders on the camp letterhead is almost a solid row of asterisks, which a footnote explains means deceased.

I am reading from a letter I received some months ago, a letter signed by Charles Ziesenhenné, commander, and attested by Sam Black, adjutant:

Seven of our members live outside of Chicago, and of the 11 who do live in town, only 3 of us are physically able to attend meetings. The same officers have to hold over year after year because there are no others able and willing to take over the jobs. We no longer pay camp dues and our per capita tax to national is paid up for some time yet. Our only expense is for funerals. Columbia Camp will not be disbanded. We will continue to the last comrade, whoever he may be. We have been friends as well as comrades. But now we are all so near to that last turn in the road of life that we can no longer function as we would like, and can only do the best we can for just as long as we can.

#### RESEARCHERS' MEASURE FOR EVALUATION

Mr. Speaker, I can only trust that what I am saying here today, on the 64th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, and which will find its lodgment in the permanent pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will furnish to future researchers

some measure for the evaluation of writings in recent years on the Spanish-American War that have given me great concern. These writers in the main seem to have been obsessed with a passion for downgrading the United States and converting the Spirit of '98, which was the expression of the finest idealism of any people in any period of the world, into a coarse and vulgar and selfish thing.

Within the last year my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who is high on my list of the ablest Members of this body, told me of his indignation on reading a book by a French writer of some repute and which he understood was being widely circulated and read in the United States. He thought that I could perform a service to my country and to the idealism that always has motivated Americans by making some reply thereto. Fortunately, perhaps, I could not obtain a copy of the book. I inquired at a number of bookstores and found it on sale at none, and from this I concluded that it was finding little reception by the American people.

Some months ago Mr. Geoffrey Gould, a highly respected member of the Press Gallery of the House, wrote a special article that was carried nationwide by Associated Press newspapers and in which he made overgenerous comments on my combativeness during many years for causes in which I believed and which I thought embodied the idealism of our country. In this connection he mentioned my service in Cuba, a lad just turning 16, one of the 19,000 Americans in the fighting days of the siege of Santiago.

A well-known columnist, whose father, although 15 or 20 years older, had been a warm personal friend of mine in my earlier newspaper days, responded with an article in which he took issue. I had no resentment, smiled a bit when I read that he doubted that he had ever met me since some years ago we did meet at the annual banquet of the Chicago Press Veterans and he informed me that his father, then past 90, was still living and I sent to him a message of old time friendship, and this columnist and I chatted for a long time in an atmosphere that to me was warm and genuine.

In his article he got a little mixed up in his data, and some of my friends thought that he was unduly unkind and others thought, as did I, that his motivation was only to give me an additional bit of publicity, in the doing of which friendly service he was handicapped by the fact that he is spokesman for a different philosophy than the one to which I, during the entire period of my life, have given my devotion and my humblest ability to the fullest extent.

But this paragraph I must answer, not because it has personal reference to me, but it is something, that on reflection, the son of my old friend I know will agree should not have been said in honor to the memory of the 266 Americans who died in Havana Harbor 64 years ago today and to the memory of the youth of this Nation that went out as volunteers to establish freedom in this world of ours, went out, fighting in the Tropics

with winter clothing and antique weapons with little food and the very minimum of medicine, went out in the greatest adventure in idealism in the history of any country. This is the passage that I wish my good friend, the columnist whose father was a warm friend of mine, had omitted:

Congressman O'HARA has a reputation as a scrapper. This includes the firecracker war in Cuba where nobody could possibly have run up a timecard of more than one 8-hour day in battle, although the cumulative pensions of some of those boys by now have amounted to thousands of dollars an hour.

The fact, my friends and colleagues, is that the veterans of the Spanish-American War, both individually and cumulatively, have received from the Government far less than any other veterans' group in the history of our country. They served for \$13 a month. They were ill equipped and subsisted in the Tropics on a diet of sowbelly, which they heated into streams of grease in which they soaked theirhardtack. This, mind you, in the Tropics. There was no record kept of their injuries. On their return home many were sick in bed for weeks and months. Thousands died at home of illnesses contracted during their service, those who had been in the disease-infected camps in this country suffering as severely from this neglect as those who had served overseas, and their families, not the Government, had to bear the expenses of doctors and medicine. There were many families impoverished and placed hopelessly in debt, in the care of their son, returning from the war with Spain to languish in illness and die. There, of course, was no provision for their education and rehabilitation. It ill becomes anyone to cast aspersions on the Spanish War veterans and to imply that they were moochers.

Moreover, the Spanish-American War brought to this country greater revenues and greater wealth than any other war in our history.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who is so highly revered by all his colleagues for his ability, his courage, and for his continued and effective fight for truth and justice.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my good friend from Ohio. Without warm friendship, on the pattern of the understanding friendship of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois, this could become a dreary world.

There were families at that time who had exhausted all their savings and were hopelessly in debt by reason of having to provide doctors and medicines for the veterans of the Spanish-American War who returned home sick. And for anyone to say that these veterans have been mooching at the expense of the public is just beyond my comprehension.

Hawaii never would have become a State in the Union but for the war with

Spain and the spirit of 1898 that changed the thinking in the minds of men everywhere. The Philippine Islands never would have had an opportunity to expand and become a bulwark of free government and our ally and ever a faithful friend in time of peril and of need except for the Spanish-American War. Far out in the Pacific there is the little island of Guam, the most far-flung American territory, which has the same kind of a government that we have, a State legislature, exactly on the pattern of our own State legislatures, and without the Spanish-American War, Guam would never have been part of this great country of ours. Since I have been in the Congress I have been the steadfast friend and champion of little Guam, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I know perhaps better than some how important to us in world understanding is Guam, the showcase of democracy in the far Pacific, the base of our naval strength. As I speak, my youngest son, Howard, is lying grievously ill in the Guam Memorial Hospital. He has given many years of his life to Guam and her people, and I think that in this dedication to a task he has experienced some sense deep within him that he in his lifetime was continuing the boyish dreams and ideals of his father. Anyway, Guam is part of the expanded world for freedom that was opened by the youth of 1898, who, as volunteers embarked upon the greatest adventure of idealism in history. I know that in the hands of the people of Guam, my son in his illness will receive every care and attention that affection can accord.

If it so could be measured—and God forbid there ever should be such a rule of measurement—but if it should be measured by returns to us of dollars and advantage, the Spanish-American War would top all the wars in history.

Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with some of the books that have been coming out. Here is one somebody sent to me last Christmas Day. It is supposed to be a history of the Spanish-American War. There are parts in it that are good, that are thrilling. In parts it is interestingly and dramatically written, but throughout the book is enough poison to undo in the eyes of the world, if this book were read all over the world, so much of the good in world opinion that came to us as the result of the idealism of 1898 and the war with Spain. I hope this was not by intent, merely that the writer, reaching for a gullible public that would flock to the bookstores, reached into the forgotten files of trivialities, picked out, as from the gutter, distended statements of proven untruths that he dressed up in lurid, gossipy, scandalous attire as the fact of the history.

This book says on one of the early pages:

Salute.

The helpful and valuable cooperation is most gratefully acknowledged of: Thelma E. Bedell, Chief of Readers' Service, U.S. Military Academy Library; Olga J. Carney; Sidney Forman, Librarian, U.S. Military Academy; Maj. Gen. Phillip E. Gallagher, U.S. Army (retired).

And then follow some other names, giving the impression that the material in this book is on the authority of the U.S. Military Academy and of the U.S. Government. I shall direct a letter to the Department of the Army pointing out the grievous mischief to us in the eyes of the world by some of the statements, entirely without foundation in the fact, and conclusions at which any author has the right to reach and to present to his readers as his own conclusions, but should be forbidden by punitive law from presenting by implication as the findings and conclusions of the great Academy at West Point, a school with an unblemished reputation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer in due course a bill to state that hereafter when anyone gives credit to these research government libraries that it shall be stated that the writings and conclusions based thereon are not to be attributed to the U.S. Government. The research libraries do a real service for the Congress and the other branches of Government. They are entitled to protection against exploitation.

This book says that the Cuban soldiers were cowardly, that the only time they were seen was when they were stealing from knapsacks. That is what this book says. And it is the barest faced lie ever put between book covers. What are the facts? I ought to know. I ought to know because I knew some Spanish when I arrived in Cuba on June 27, 1898, and had had some experience in jungle traveling about in Central America before I was in Cuba. I was assigned six Cuban soldiers to serve on a squad to do observation work. With those Cuban soldiers we penetrated the Spanish lines day after day, of course, encountering all of the perils that soldiers always encounter when they are on duty in densely wooded terrain far within the enemy line with sharpshooters around.

Mr. Speaker, I was with General Garcia, stationed just outside of Santiago at an outpost in the area of greatest danger far beyond the outer American lines. I never saw better soldiers in my life than the Cuban soldiers that fought with us at the siege of Santiago. When after an absence of 57 years, I returned to Santiago, where I had not been since I was a boy just turned 16, Two Cubans came up and threw their arms around me and hugged me. I hugged them and we hugged again and kissed one another, old men of the two armies that had fought together to free Cuba. They were two of the Cuban soldiers with whom as a lad of 16 I had been on that mission. For a modern American writer, lured by the sale of his book, at this late day to throw mud at the Cuban soldiers at Santiago is hitting below the belt with the instinct of a sadist.

Then, when I find that someone writes a book like this, without one iota of fact, but fiction, and the publisher puts it out and says that at the time of our present relations with Cuba this will make a contribution to better understanding, yes, that is why I am taking this full hour today. There must be some answer to this.

Mr. Speaker, there is also in this book an attack—a sneaking, cowardly attack—on General Shafter, the commanding general of our army in Cuba. Yes, he was a large man. He weighed, I think over 300 pounds. He was badly affected by the climate. But all military men are agreed that he was a great strategist. Yet this fellow says that he had no plan of battle. It apparently was more convenient to say that than to take the time to look at a chart of the campaign. Now, let me explain the plan of battle to you. We hear so much about San Juan Hill, and we should. It is one of the great chapters of heroism in the history of our country.

But it was only part of the action. The action extended from San Juan Hill to Fort Aguadores. At Fort Aguadores 8,000 Spanish reinforcements were reported on their way. That point was defended by 3,000 Cubans and 900 raw American troops, of which I was one. The action was scarcely as tame and placid as a day at a summer picnic. I did not feel that way when, within minutes, four of my comrades nearby were killed by cannon fire. As far as the author of this book was concerned the death of my comrades meant nothing to him. The 33d Michigan did not exist. He had reached the conclusion that Shafter was just a fat, old, crazy fool, that General Jose Toral, commander of the Spanish forces and, as brave, competent and gentlemanly as any general in Spanish history, was a cowardly incompetent, and he persisted in his determination to have his way by burying every known hurt in the graveyard of his determined will. We had left Siboney at 4 o'clock in the morning of July 1, 1898 carrying heavy luggage. In those days you had heavy cartridge belts around your shoulders and around your waist. It was a long walk, but we got there.

And here was a great river with a bridge that had been partly destroyed, and across it fortifications in the mountains. It was not long until we suffered our first casualties. And where were those casualties? In Company M, composed of the sons of Civil War veterans. Each one of the members of Company M was the son of a boy in blue. Five of them were killed or maimed.

Now, mind you, in this book there are some parts that are good and exciting. The publisher says that this man successfully writes history because he makes it readable. Well, he does. It is absolutely just as readable as one of these gossip magazines; you know the kind, they hear a whisper someplace and a lot of gossip. That is all right in its place, although it is no place I wish to be. But when it is put in there to reflect upon veterans of the Spanish-American War, to reflect upon our officers, to reflect upon the privates and the individuals, to reflect upon the honor of our Nation, there is a limit to patience and toleration. The cruelest cut of all was an acknowledgment that put the West Point Academy right in the center, and that was not coming to a military academy—that is part of our dearest traditions.

Now, the day will come when the researchers will be trying to reconstruct the period through which we have gone and, believe me, my friends, the Spanish-American War was just part of one 50-year war that started America on her course of destiny. When they come to that period they will be reading so many of these books that are coming out now, written by people who think that the way to get into the writing business and to get people buying new books is to avoid facts and write what the people will read. So I hope that when these researchers of the faraway future may be thumbing through the forgotten pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find what I am saying today on the floor of the House of Representatives in my 79th year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often again I will be talking on the 15th of February on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. As long as I am here, I am going to talk on that subject on this anniversary. But I have no way of telling what measure of years are left. My own philosophy is that I will be here for many, many years. But I could be very, very wrong. My own philosophy is that one lives best when one lives in the present. When one is young and wants to be older, he loses the joy of living in the present of his youth. So it is when one has gone far toward the setting sun. I have heard a saying, not that I take it too seriously, someone told me once that there was a rumor around, and I hope it is only a rumor, that every man has to die. Well, I am not going to believe that rumor until they prove it in my case, and then I will be past the point of protest.

#### NO REALLY GOOD HISTORY OF THE WAR

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have looked over many of the books on the Spanish American War. We have no really good history that has been written of the Spanish American War. I was looking for some mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan. When I was in Cuba after 57 years absence, I went out to the place at Siboney where we had landed 2 or 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt, getting out of small boats, as they did in the recent war, to fight our way shoreward. There I found a plaque, I suppose some commercial concern had made it up and put it there. It had been there a good many years. It announced that the 33d Michigan Volunteers had arrived weeks after the fighting and then some other regiments were mentioned as having been in the fighting which were not there until some time after the fighting.

As I have said there is no mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan in the book I have been biting at. I thought if I left this record stand, my good friend, the columnist whose father was a good friend of mine, will say, "Now there is a phony—he talks of getting to Cuba with that regiment of his a few days after Teddy Roosevelt and of being in all the fighting and here these modern writers do not mention it. He must be a phony."

Well, I want this to be in the RECORD. Maybe I am enough lawyer to want a

little something in the record, this is admissible under the laws of evidence, to combat the things good people get into their heads when they listen too much to chatty gossipers, you know the species. This is from the history of the war by the then Secretary of War Alger:

June 27 the *Yale* arrived at Siboney with General Duffield and part of his brigade consisting of the 33d Michigan and 1 battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men.

Then he goes on to explain that an invasion of 8,000 new Spanish troops was reported and that the action had been held pending our arrival, and so we were immediately pushed to the front in that gap.

Only 900 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba at that time, the remainder of our brigade being delayed, but only a few days after that, the 9th Massachusetts arrived and the 34th Michigan arrived.

He goes on to say that in this circumstance the first to arrive in Cuba on the 27th day of June participating in all the fighting that lasted from the 27th to the 2d day of July—the armistice was not until the 17th, but the fighting practically ended the 2d day of July—were these 900 men of the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

So Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks what Secretary of War Alger said about the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FROM SECRETARY OF WAR ALGER'S HISTORY OF THE WAR

June 27th the *Yale* arrived at Siboney, with General Duffield and part of his brigade, consisting of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men. General Duffield was at once directed to place a large force at work upon the road leading from Siboney to the camp of the army in the vicinity of Sevilla. Late in the afternoon of the next day, General Shafter was informed that General Pando, with 8,000 Spanish regulars, was advancing from Manzanillo to relieve the garrison in Santiago. Pando was reported to be within 54 miles of the city, and moving at the rate of 12 miles a day, with an abundance of supplies in the way of pack-trains and beef on the hoof. If the Spanish general met with no opposition, this would bring a strong force, with a large quantity of food, for the relief of General Linares, by the 2d or 3d of July. General Shafter determined, if possible, to prevent General Pando's entering Santiago, and to make the attack without waiting for the additional reinforcements, consisting of the remainder of Duffield's brigade, then en route.

General Garcia, with 3,000 Cubans, was requested, on the 29th, to proceed from Siboney to the west and northwest of Santiago and guard the approaches over which the advancing Spanish reinforcements, under Pando, would come. The American outposts were pushed forward to within 1½ miles of Santiago, and General Shafter established his headquarters in advance of the whole army on the Santiago road at the point where it branches with the trail leading to Caney. The next day he determined upon his plan of attack, and gave directions for the disposition of the several divisions, preparatory to the assault, July 1. He proposed to throw his army against the entrenched

position of the enemy on the heights of San Juan: Lawton's division on the right Wheeler's division in the center, and Kent's division on the left. Bates' brigade was ordered up from Siboney to the front, to be held in reserve, with two batteries of light artillery, and three troops of Rafferty's mounted cavalry. The remaining troop of the 2d Cavalry was sent with Lawton, as well as a battery of artillery—Capron's (the father of Captain Capron, who was killed on the 24th at Las Guasimas)—while General Shafter directed General Duffield, with one regiment, to make a demonstration against the extreme right of the Spaniards at Aguadores Bridge.

Only 1,200 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba, as the Navy had directed the *Harvard*, transporting the remainder of his brigade, to convey a repair ship which could make but 8 or 10 knots an hour. This delayed the arrival of his command by nearly 2 days—too late to take part in the engagement of July 1. General Duffield's command on the 1st of July consisted only of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th Michigan. The latter acted as a guard at Siboney. It was not intended that General Duffield, with his small force of 900 men, should attack, across the San Juan, the fortified heights which rose abruptly from that river 300 or 400 feet; but, as General Shafter stated in an official report, General Duffield "was expected to make such a demonstration at Aguadores as would hold at the place all Spanish troops occupying it, and prevent their reinforcing the main body at Santiago. This he accomplished perfectly."

A deep and wide ravine separated the Spanish position from General Duffield's advance. At this season of the year the river, which flows between the high and precipitous banks of this gorge, was broad, swift, and deep—600 to 700 feet in width, and spanned by an iron girder bridge 60 feet above. About 100 feet of the trestle on the Spanish side of the San Juan had been blown up. Moreover, as was subsequently learned and at the time suspected, all that was left of the bridge had been mined. Then, too, the river was not fordable, and had General Duffield's instructions contemplated an assault, which they did not, it would have been impossible for him to cross the San Juan River, since he had no boats or means of throwing any part of his small force across the swollen river.

The enemy, protected by stone forts, blockhouses, and rifle pits along the cliffs, was subsequently learned to have been 500 strong, supported by artillery—a force almost equal to that which kept General Lawton's division of over 4,000 a whole day at Caney. In addition to these troops, two companies of marines (about 400 men) from Cervera's fleet were at Las Cruces and vicinity, where they were held in reserve at a distance of about 5 miles on the railroad leading to Aguadores and from where they could be brought to this place in a very short time. The local conditions were such that our warships could not see nor reach many of the trenches across the river confronting General Duffield, and at the very instant the vessels firing upon the heights signaled "there are no Spaniards in the rifle pits," a volley from the enemy wounded several of our men.

General Duffield's demonstration, coupled with the movement of Garcia on the northwest of Santiago, brought about what General Shafter had hoped—i.e., the Spaniards were kept in doubt as to his real movements and deterred from concentrating their forces at San Juan Ridge.

While General Duffield was making the beforementioned feint at Aguadores Bridge, Admiral Sampson was requested to bombard that place, as a part of the maneuver, and to direct such firing against the Spanish

works at the mouth of the harbor of Santiago as in his judgment might seem best to further divert the enemy's attention from the main advance. This he did.

Before moving out to take up the positions assigned them, preparatory to the attack the next morning, General Shafter called the general officers to his headquarters and explained to them fully the plan of battle and the part each was to take in it. This meeting was attended by the division commanders Lawton and Kent, acting division commander General Sumner, and the brigade commanders Chaffee, Hawkins, Ludlow, and Duffield, as well as the Cuban General Castillo. The battle of July 1 was conducted in direct accord with these plans, with the exception that it took Lawton's division a day instead of 2 hours, as estimated, to reduce Caney.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am closing with a voice that is shaky; and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am very close to tears, all from the feeling within me that I have not adequately treated and as is my solemn obligation to my comrades of a war of 64 years ago, most of them gone, this subject which to me is sacred. I would have wished that I could have made it as crystal clear as clearness itself that the war of 1898 and the spirit of 1898 were the embodiment of the greatest ideals that ever moved any people in any stage of history. I have tried, Mr. Commander of Columbia Camp, to follow your orders to our remaining veterans: "To do the best we can for just as long as we can."

Mr. Speaker, I have finished.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is reported to have discussed with King Saud of Saudi Arabia continued United States presence at the Dhahran Airbase, I believe that it is important for the Congress, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "to square our politics with our principles" and to make clear our unyielding opposition to discrimination by foreign governments against U.S. citizens.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of the United States Constitution that there shall not be discrimination against United States citizens based on race, religion, creed, or color; and

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the basic rights of United States citizens in their lawful pursuit of trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas any attempt by foreign nations to discriminate among United States citizens on the basis of race, religion, creed, or color in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that any such discrimination

directed against United States citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, that the United States should issue a strong protest against such discrimination, that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, the United States should insist upon the elimination of such discrimination, and that the United States should not be a party to any agreement which allows a foreign nation to discriminate against United States citizens because of race, religion, creed or color.

The Dhahran Airbase was established during World War II. In 1951 a 5-year agreement for the use of the Dhahran facilities by the United States was signed with the Saudi Arabian Government. The agreement was extended for an additional 5 years in April 1957. Both the 1951 agreement and the 1957 treaty gave the Saudi Arabian Government the right to reject any member of the American mission which it considers objectionable or unacceptable. The practical effect of this clause has been to exclude American Jews from serving at Dhahran.

By acquiescing in the barring of U.S. personnel from our installations at Dhahran, our Government has countenanced affronts to our citizens and cast doubt upon our ideals. It is impossible to defend and deny democracy simultaneously. Either our men are serving overseas to defend freedom and our principles—in which case they must be permitted to live up to them—or they are men without a mission.

Last year Saudi Arabia notified the United States that the lease would not be renewed in April 1962. Now there are reports of negotiations for continued use of the base. I urge the administration to insist that there be no further restrictions because of race, religion, creed, or color upon the admission of military personnel to the base. We should not send a single American to a base where all Americans are not accorded equal treatment.

Our Government should make it clear that the ethnic, racial, or religious background of American citizens is not the legitimate concern of any foreign government. Ever since our Nation was founded, we have opened our doors to the people of many nations and given them new life, new hope, and a new nationality. The rights of American citizens under the Constitution must be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination by Arab countries against U.S. citizens is well known. Only last year Helen Hayes and the American Theater Guild Company were banned from Cairo because the group planned to visit Israel on its tour; a former Washington, D.C., WAC on her way from Bombay to Rome was forced to remain on the plane during a stopover at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, because the crew feared that the Saudis would discover that she was Jewish and the plane would be detained; the central office of the Arab League Boycott of Israel in Damascus, Syria, announced that Actor Eddie Cantor and six American business companies were placed on the blacklist.

Arab discrimination has persisted since May 15, 1948, when after almost 2,000 years of exile and after the slaugh-

ter of 6 million of their brethren the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the State of Israel.

Although the creation of the new state was sanctioned by the General Assembly of the United Nations, six states set themselves above the community of nations. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia attacked Israel with the announced intention of effecting "a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades." However, they were unsuccessful. Israel defeated the invaders, and in the spring and summer of 1949 Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan signed armistice agreements with Israel.

The armistice agreements had been concluded with a view to promoting the return of permanent peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace. As a provisional measure they were generally expected to be a brief prelude to formal peace treaties. This hope was short lived. Most people are familiar with the military aspects of the continuing Arab war on Israel. Not so well known is the economic warfare employed by the Arab States to undermine Israel's economic stability and to isolate her.

In May 1951, the Council of the League of Arab States adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of economic boycott offices in all of the Arab States. The boycott itself was applied to all firms with branches in Israel and all companies doing business with Israel. They were blacklisted. In addition, any ship calling on an Israel port was prevented from docking in an Arab port, and no planes landing in Israel were permitted to fly in Arab skies. These were the original provisions of the Arab boycott.

Since 1951, however, the scope of the boycott has been vastly extended to include: the blacklisting of many American companies having Americans of the Jewish faith among their officers, owners, directors, or even personnel; the refusing of visas to Americans of Jewish faith and forbidding them to disembark in some Arab countries.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department should be resolute and vigorous in protecting our citizens from such religious discrimination. On August 15, 1961, during the debate on the foreign aid bill I fought for a strong statement of policy against these abuses of our national sovereignty and indignities inflicted upon our citizens. I said then, "we must be resolute on this issue or fail to live up to our ideals." Our principles are basic. Justice and equality are empty slogans unless we demand equal treatment for all our citizens from all nations.

In considering the question of the Dhahran Airbase and the Arab boycott, we might well recall the words of Woodrow Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey, on December 6, 1911, in protesting Russian discrimination against Americans of Jewish faith. He stated:

They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens. \* \* \* By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our

genuineness, the reality of principle among us. \* \* \* There is here a greater stake than any other upon which we could set our hearts. Here is the final test of our ability to square our politics with our principles. We may now enjoy the exhilaration of matching our professions with handsome performance. We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow citizens, but to make evidence our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America's. It is the cause of all who love justice and do right.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in upholding the finest traditions of our Nation and support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from New York.

You will recall last year I offered a similar amendment to the Peace Corps bill, and it was adopted by the House but taken out by the Senate. The conference committee agreed to the Senate's elimination of the amendment. I agree with the gentleman. I feel this should be true in the armed services as well as in the Peace Corps or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am happy he has been one of the leaders in this fight to eliminate such discrimination wherever it is.

#### CERTAIN FRANKING PRIVILEGES

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the Post Office and Treasury Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, inserted a clause in an appropriations bill which would give Members of Congress the right to send mail under their franking privilege merely by addressing the envelope "Occupant." At that time, I opposed the particular amendment to the bill, and we were successful in defeating it.

Last year the same amendment was inserted in the appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury. Adding this clause giving Members of the Congress the right to send "Occupant" mail to their constituents was one of the last things the House of Representative did under the final supplemental appropriations bill of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It is interesting to note that the measure came to the floor in the wee hours of the morning. I tried to open it to debate, but I was ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker, originally, 2 years ago, I stated on the floor of this House that the privilege would be abused if given to Members of Congress. I further stated that it was unfair to the taxpayers of the United States because they did not enjoy the same privilege and that if we were going to extend it to

Members of Congress, then all the taxpayers should have it as well.

Several weeks ago this House of Representatives passed a postal rate increase amounting to 25 percent on first-class mail and up to 61 percent on other classes of mail. In total, it is an increase in rates to the taxpayers of \$700 million. We have an enormous postal deficit at the present time and that was the reason for approving the postal rate increase. We are now compounding the felony by adding to the future deficit of the Post Office through increasing the amount of "Occupant" mail that it must handle without payment. This is a flagrant use of a double standard—one for the taxpayers and another for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members of the House to take a walk down through the tunnel from the Old House Office Building to the cafeteria in the New House Office Building. There, lined up like a camel caravan, are millions of pieces of mail addressed "Occupant" and ready to be sent out to people all over the United States. It is my understanding that the House folding room is over a month behind in its work because of the vast increase in the use of "Occupant" mailings. I hope that this year, when the appropriations bill is considered by the House, we can offer a successful amendment to repeal this legislation.

Furthermore, only recently the House passed a bill providing \$475,000 to study fire hazards here in the buildings on the Capitol Grounds and to make certain improvements to prevent fires. Certainly, if I have ever seen a fire hazard here in the Capitol Buildings, it is that hall crowded with piles of mail that nearly close off the passage. Up on the wall in that same hall is a sign sometimes hidden by the stacks of mail, designating it as a "shelter area." This, to me, is just another mockery of the nationwide effort to provide protection against the dangers of atomic attack, for the number of people that could possibly use the hallway as a shelter has been greatly reduced as a result of its usage as a storage area.

Many of our constituents have written to us that they dislike receiving junk mail from mailing houses throughout the country. I agree with them. And, I know that if I were an American taxpayer, I would resent receiving an envelope carelessly marked "Occupant" from any Congressman. To me it would be just as objectionable as receiving junk mail. I hope that we will repudiate this measure yet this year.

#### AIR FORCE CONTRACTS WITH CONVAIR

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the House

to the yearend report by the Comptroller General which examines cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts made by the Air Force with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., for special tooling pursuant to the B-58 program.

The report discloses that Convair received unwarranted fee allowances to the amount of \$382,000 on a \$6 million contract. Under the present system, as the Comptroller's report points out, the Air Force has categorized its contracts in two ways: The first is for routine procurement, for example, industrial facilities which procurement regulations specify should be acquired under a no-fee facilities contract; the second is for special tooling and permits special fee allowances. Special tooling by definition includes "acquisitions by the contractor for use in performance of the contract, which are of such a specialized nature that, without substantial modification or alteration, their use is limited to the production of such supplies or parts thereof, or the performance of such services, as are peculiar to the needs of the Government."

The present grievance concerns the fact that Air Force contracting officials allowed Convair to acquire at Government expense, hangar-type buildings and certain test equipment as special tooling under supply contracts for B-58 airplanes and to receive additional fees of \$328,000 on the estimated cost of these items, even though ample information was available to show that the buildings and equipment were not special to the B-58 but could be readily adapted for use with almost any military or commercial aircraft in service. Thus by classifying the hangars as special tooling the Air Force bypassed a number of procedures specifically designed to insure that such overcharging and misclassification did not occur.

As the Comptroller emphatically points out:

Convair and Air Force contracting officials should have recognized \* \* \* that the items were not special tooling but were industrial facilities which procurement regulations specifically designate to be acquired under no-fee facilities contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that through the combination of the practices of Convair and sloppy administrative procedures by the Air Force, Convair has been allowed to charge exorbitant special fees for the procurement of routine hangars for airplanes. Necessarily the cost of such sheer inefficiency and incredibly poor business practice falls on the taxpayers.

Only because of this study by the Comptroller General were we able to detect these high overcharges in one \$6 million contract. I believe that such discrepancies as the study uncovers pinpoints the immediate need for a correction of such procedural loopholes in Government contracting and I urge the immediate formulation of more business-like procurement and administrative reforms to insure against duplicity or oversight.

Specifically, I recommend that the Air Force should initiate action to recover the additional charges on the Convair

contract. It should also change its records procedures to transfer the B-58 run and maintenance stations from a special tooling contract to a nonspecial facility contract.

In closing, I would like to reemphasize that, as in the B-58 hangar case, the improper treatment of facilities resulted in bypassing reviews needed to assure that contractors do not procure facilities already available in Government inventories.

We need to institute new procedures which protect us against overpurchasing and against overcharging. The taxpayer can ill afford such unnecessary waste.

I hope that the recommendations and the report of the Comptroller General is given early and positive consideration.

#### ABUSE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which I believe will terminate a serious abuse of the franking privilege.

A few weeks ago, the House passed the Postal Revision Act of 1962, the chief purpose of which is to abate or eliminate the recurring deficits in the operations of the Post Office Department, which have become a serious drain upon the Treasury.

The bill, as it passed the House, made an allocation of costs to public service operations by the Post Office Department which apparently nearly all of the Members here regarded as fair and reasonable. Then, to bridge the gap in postal revenues between costs and receipts, we increased to nearly all users of the mails the rates which we will require them to pay for such use.

The rates for users of first-class mail, which is the type which the general public uses most in its own mailing, are increased by 25 percent in the Postal Revision Act of 1962 which the House passed and sent to the Senate. The rates for the various types of commercial users of the mails have been increased by even higher rates, ranging up to 61 percent.

Although the general public appears to be tolerant of this necessary increase in rates, it is apparent that some of the commercial users of the mails are not happy, but so long as the rates are equitable in relation to the extent the postal service is used, we may expect that the increases which have been proven necessary will be absorbed as part of the increased cost of doing business.

In the hearings last year on the Postal Revision Act, and in discussions off the floor, there has been a lot of discussion about junk mail. All of us I am sure, have been receiving from some of our constituents a considerable volume of mail concerning it. Junk mail may be

an inappropriate term, depending upon whether you are the sender or the receiver; but the term has come to be applied to all third class bulk mailings, and particularly to those which are sent to no addressee by name. In the bill which the House passed, the minimum rate for third class bulk mailings has been increased to 3 cents. The minimum bulk rate, as compared with what it was in 1950, has been increased by 150 percent.

The justification for these increases is that the Government needs the additional money to run the Post Office Department.

Under the circumstances, then, it seems particularly inappropriate, unwise, and unjustifiable for us as Members of Congress to use the franking privilege in a way that is extravagant and outrageous.

The bill which I have introduced today would repeal the authority given in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, passed by the House and by the Senate and signed by the President on September 30, 1961, to send mail to occupant at every address in every post office, on city carrier routes and on rural routes, and to send it under the congressional frank.

I have never used this type of mail. Perhaps my mailings are less extensive than those of some other Members. But at a time when the postal deficit is a matter of such great concern to the Congress, it seems to me self-evident that it is up to us as Members to help to eliminate it or to keep it within bounds by restricting the use of the frank to what has been customary and acceptable throughout our history.

My bill today would eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address. If commercial firms want to send out tons of mail to "Occupants," let them pay for it; but, under the terms of my bill, the Members of Congress will not do it.

In eliminating this, I suspect that we may be doing ourselves a favor. Advertisers and commercial firms insist that the average citizen feels no resentment when mail is addressed to him as an "Occupant" and not by his name.

Be that as it may; but I believe that the average voter likes to be addressed by name when his Congressman communicates with him, and not as a faceless, anonymous "Occupant," communicated with only in bulk.

At any rate, I sincerely believe that the bill which I have introduced will clarify a situation which is unsound from every standpoint. I hope that it may receive prompt and favorable consideration at this session of the Congress.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE FIRST SOKOL (FALCON) EDUCATIONAL AND PHYSICAL CULTURE ORGANIZATION IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues this afternoon in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the first Sokol Educational and Physical Cultural Organization in Prague, Czechoslovakia, on February 16, 1862. This organization, which was to have a profound effect on history, was organized by a group of public-spirited men to whom liberty and democracy were a cherished ideal. These men, well versed in the history and philosophy of the past, wanted freedom and liberty for their people. They realized that only a nation which is willing to prepare for and retain independence must maintain it by constant vigilance. They stressed, realized, and fought for the development of the entire individual—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. The founders of this organization created a terminology for calisthenics, apparatus exercises, and games that is so precise that units thousands of miles apart can practice the assigned drills, then meet at the great Sokol exhibitions and after only one general rehearsal, perform as if they had trained together for months.

The first Sokol unit in the United States was organized in St. Louis in 1865, and within a few years units were organized in Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, and other cities in this country. Today, they reach from coast to coast—from Canada to Mexico, and there are also Sokol units throughout the world—all dedicated to freedom and liberty. Their loyalty and ability to serve is proverbial. In every war in which this country has been involved, Sokol gymnasiums have become bare of their men's and junior classes. Within the last few years, units have been built new or expanded their old gymnasiums in Baltimore, Cleveland, and other cities. Many more are planning new improved facilities in dozens of localities. They support their own gymnasiums, community centers, and children's camps. They have trained and given outstanding coaches and leaders to colleges, high schools, and playgrounds by the hundreds. Now, on the threshold of their own centennial, they are intensifying their efforts to bring more of their fellow citizens into their active life.

The Sokols are respected in every land that is free. They are hated and feared by every form of dictatorship. They were the first organizations to be dissolved by the Nazis and Communists wherever these usurped power. The Sokol leaders were the first to be imprisoned and liquidated. The Second World War saw 90 percent of the Sokol leaders liquidated in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The few that were left have found a similar fate at the hands of the Communists. The great mass of the former powerful Sokol organizations in Europe are far from being exterminated or completely docile. The great spirit of

freedom, liberty, and human justice instilled in them by courageous men and women for almost a century is still very much alive and is transferred to each new group of children. We know that those who have once known freedom and liberty as we know it will never forget it.

These Sokol trained people have faith in the inexorable destiny of mankind. The Sokols in America have produced their own great leaders and thinkers. Men and women in all walks of life have felt that their greatest contribution to this great land would be to devotedly serve in the Sokol ranks, to constantly train the young in that physical, mental, moral, and spiritual strength that is the bulwark of a nation.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESTAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sincerity that I appear before this House today to extend appreciation and gratitude to Members who have played an important part in providing funds for flood control and water conservation projects in southern California.

As you have seen and read, the Los Angeles area was recently struck with a vicious, multiday rainstorm. After 6 days of driving rain, Los Angeles residents thought they might be living and working in an oversized bathtub. The Small Business Administration has declared Los Angeles County a disaster area.

Television and newspapers recorded pictures of the scene: rivers of water running down city streets, front lawns that served as bottoms of huge lakes, automobiles submerged to their rooftops.

Certainly, the damage done by city street flooding is terrible, but it is far better than having an entire mountain-side come tumbling down onto our cities and towns. Fortunately, this was not the case and we in southern California can thank the Members of this House for the part they played.

I have appeared before numerous committees since coming to the Congress, pointing to the need for Federal funds to protect the Los Angeles metropolitan area from the potential disasters of the Angeles National Forest. The Angeles National Forest, which lies almost entirely in my district, is a Federal responsibility—and that responsibility must be met. The dangers of flood and fire are ever present. And, as we have also said many times, the taxpayers of Los Angeles County have not been remiss in their responsibilities in helping to protect their lives and property.

The recent tremendous rainstorms, which dumped 10 to 23 inches on the Los Angeles area, supplied the first real test

of preparations we have made over the past 8 or 10 years. Cogswell Dam above the foothill cities of Monrovia, Sierra Madre, and Arcadia—all in my congressional district—was deluged with 23 inches of rain, but this and other check dams held fast.

These dams were constructed, in part, through funds supplied by the U.S. Congress. This heavy rainfall is a test which proves the worth of such measures. Much more is to be done, but the progress already made has protected lives and property.

City street flooding was serious. The problem of city street flooding must be met by more and better local storm drain systems. Yet, Federal funds and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, under the magnificent guidance of Chief Engineer M. E. Salisbury, staved off potential disaster. Floods coming out of these mountain canyons are more than walls of water; they are composed of debris, rocks and stones, and boulders which reach the size of automobiles.

I pay thanks to my colleagues in the House today for their splendid support in the past and we in southern California shall hope for that support in the future.

#### SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 142d anniversary of the birth of a great woman and noble American, Susan B. Anthony.

Her life was dedicated to achieving equality for the women of America. Through her influence and effort, the New York Legislature passed the act giving married women the guardianship of their children, the possession of their earnings, and a greater degree of equality under the law. Her most notable contribution to our society was, of course, her part in securing the enfranchisement for American women. But more important than these legal measures were the opportunities they opened to women to contribute to the cultural, intellectual, and professional progress of our great Nation.

Susan B. Anthony was a native of Adams, Mass., which I have the privilege to represent. Her crusade took her across our land though, and to accomplish her goals, she became a teacher, newspaperwoman, and lecturer. We are proud of Susan Anthony, not only for what she did for the status of American women, but because she has become a symbol for a cause still being fought in many parts of the world. By no means is the battle over, nor will it be until all the women of the world are given equal educational, political, and economic rights and opportunities. This Nation has led the way by maintaining a firm belief in equality of opportunity. This principle has been amply substantiated when we look at the role played

by women in the professions, politics, and all walks of life.

On this, the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to her memory and with women everywhere who are grateful for her having devoted a lifetime to their cause.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I should like to pay tribute once again to the memory of Susan B. Anthony, on this the anniversary of her birth.

Susan B. Anthony, born February 15, 1820, was perhaps the most devoted and courageous leader of the women's suffrage movement in America. She was a dynamic, selfless crusader who devoted herself completely to the cause of equality for women. She had few equals as a leader, for she possessed those qualities of greatness which marked her immediately as a giant among women.

Miss Anthony spent much of her life in Rochester, N.Y., my own home city, and her memory lingers today in the minds and hearts of many women of our community. Her home has been restored as a memorial and the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., has been established to perpetuate her memory and the memory of the great work which she accomplished.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has designated today as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State, and I should like to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the Governor's proclamation concerning Susan B. Anthony:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF NEW YORK,  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER

Although Susan B. Anthony was born in Massachusetts, we proudly claim her as one of the great New Yorkers who helped to make history. Most of her adult life was passed and her effective work for freedom, justice, and equality was accomplished in the Empire State.

She was agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society for New York State before she began to devote herself almost exclusively to the agitation for women's rights. Her motto was: "The true Republic—men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

Susan Anthony could not foresee the preponderance in numbers of women over men which exists today. Her work resulted in adoption of what we know as the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the 19th amendment giving women the right to vote.

It is right that we honor this great and fearless American. Courage of a rare sort was needed to carry her and her associates through the hostility, and above all, the ridicule they encountered: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1962, as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State. Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in

the city of Albany this 6th day of February in the year of our Lord 1962.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

I should also like to include in the RECORD at this time a resolution adopted by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. regarding the proposed equal rights amendment to the United States Constitution:

Whereas Miss Susan B. Anthony believed in perfect equality of rights for women, civil, legal, and political; and

Whereas at first women obtained only political; and

Whereas women now are working to secure civil and legal equality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., at the corporation meeting held in the Anthony Home on November 28, 1961, go on record as favoring the civil and legal equality which Miss Anthony in her lifetime approved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Anthony Corp. approves the equal rights amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative JESSICA WEIS and to Representative HAROLD OSTERTAG and to the New York State Senators KEATING and JAVITS.

Mrs. GEORGE HOWARD,  
President.  
Mrs. FRED WILKINSON,  
Recording Secretary.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 1 hour, for Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for Wednesday, February 21, 1962, vacating his special order for Monday, February 19, 1962.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 2 hours, on March 8, 1962.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOELSON in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD.

Mr. LANE.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. BRADEMAs.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. AYRES.

Mrs. WEIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. NATCHER.  
Mr. GALLAGHER.  
Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 12, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85-699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa; and

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, pursuant to section 201(b) of Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1693. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a selective examination of payments for construction of facilities and installation of equipment under Department of the Air Force combination firm fixed-price and cost-reimbursement prime contracts negotiated with Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and the authority of the Comptroller General, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1694. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the State of Tennessee, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1695. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on review of selected highway transportation activities, Post Office Department, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and Public Law 86-682 (39 U.S.C. 2206); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1696. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of procurement and storage of general-use hand tools for the Air Force by General Services Administration, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1697. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1698. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid under section 2672 for the period from January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 7652(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution amending rule XXXV, Rules of the House of Representatives, 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8399, a bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 530. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 10050. A bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Fong Kai Dong; with amendment (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10202. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10203. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10204. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 10205. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10206. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10207. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the cabaret tax in the case of certain fund-raising affairs conducted by nonprofit charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10209. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10210. A bill to provide an increase of 15 percent in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 10211. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain veterans of armed forces allied or associated with the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10212. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation* at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who fur-

nish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10214. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to define the term "person" or "producers" under the 1962 wheat and feed grain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10215. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10216. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10217. A bill to repeal the provision of the Hill-Burton Act which permits Federal assistance for hospitals which discriminate against persons on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 10218. A bill to authorize the purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds, and to provide that the dollar value of such bonds purchased by the United States shall not exceed the aggregate dollar value of such bonds purchased by other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 10219. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 10220. A bill to eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 10221. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 10222. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Charlottesville, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 10223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit life insurance companies to be taxed on capital gains in the same manner as all other corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10224. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10225. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital," approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10226. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages

lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10227. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 10228. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 629. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of "Hearings on Small Business Problems in Poultry Industry, 87th Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination against U. S. citizens by foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 545. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which employment in the Federal Government is denied to individuals because of age; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 546. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue a commemorative half-dollar coin in honor of Arizona's 50th year of statehood and so that the people of the whole Nation may join hands in honoring this significant

event; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10230. A bill for the relief of Lillias Jane Reid McKnight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10231. A bill for the relief of Olympia Barbano Clingo, Rosa Clingo, and Pietro Clingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10232. A bill for the relief of Myra Milne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10233. A bill for the relief of Umberto Vecchiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10234. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilya Spigland, Shila Spigland, and Nitsana Spigland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10235. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10236. A bill for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10237. A bill for the relief of Eleni Andrikopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10238. A bill for the relief of Chrysanthi Stavros Katsaras and Andronikos S. Katsaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10239. A bill for the relief of Lidija Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 10240. A bill for the relief of Dennis Koutroubis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10241. A bill for the relief of Dan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10242. A bill to amend Private Law 86-389; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10243. A bill for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10244. A bill for the relief of Arle Abramovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

238. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of taxpayers of the town of Masonville, Delaware County, N.Y., relative to welfare relief regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

239. Also, petition of the Community Garden Club of Newburgh, N.Y., urging passage of the wilderness bill, S. 174; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rt. Rev. Michael Kemezis, pastor, Sts. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian R. C. Parish, Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Our Divine Majesty, Lord and God, look down, we beseech Thee, upon this august gathering of the Senators of our Nation and hear our suppliant plea.

O God, how long is our sister nation Lithuania to suffer. We realize that Thou chastiseth those whom Thou lovest, and it will always be the prayer of Thy Son—not our will but Thine be done.

We beseech Thee to listen to our plea. We, who are of this great land which Thou hast blest, thank Thee for our President, our Vice President, and for our great men and women in Congress.

O Lord, help and assist them to be imbued with a spirit of prayer and divine inspiration to work and make our laws and our country's commitments according to Thy will.

O good and almighty God, help our Lithuanian brethren in their bondage, give them courage and hope, so that by their suffering and sacrifice, they may gain Thy favor, so that once more they may live as freemen in a world created by Thee—to serve and honor Thee—to live in peace with our fellow men and our sister nations.

Peace Thou came to give—yes, peace Thou can give to men of good will. We pray and beg of Thee to make us understand Thy charity for our fellow men and our sister nations.

May God bless you and keep you. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.